The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXVIII, No. 1 JANUARY, 1948

CONTENTS

Monsignor Guilday . . . *William J. Lallou* 1

Brownson's Technique in Apologetics
Thomas R. Ryan, C.PP.S. 12

"If the Trumpet Give an Uncertain Sound"
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 23

The Ordeal of Father Wall. Part I *Thomas Owen Martin* 31

Sacred Art-Music of the Renaissance
Francis J. Guentner, S.J. 42

St. Augustine's Use of the Note of Catholicity
Joseph Clifford Fenton 47

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Alleluia Additions on Corpus Christi . . . 59

"Blessed" and "Blest" Again 59

The Mandantum on Holy Thursday 59

Precedence in the Order of Common Masses and Offices . 60

Mass at the Re-Burial of Deceased Veterans . . . 61

Honest Bankruptcy 61

The Place for a Woman's Confession 62

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States and Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic Univesity of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1948, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Morality of Autopsy 63

Beneficiaries of the *Missa pro populo* 64

ANALECTA 65

BOOK REVIEWS

Decreta septem priorum Sessionum Concilii Tridentini sub Paulo III Pont. Max . . . edidit, adnotavit, prolegomenis instruxit . . . . . *Stephanus Kuttner* 71

The Art of a Happy Marriage . *by James A. Magner* 74

Claude Dubuis, Bishop of Galveston . *by L. V. Jacks* 75

Keeper of the Keys. A Life of Pope Pius XII, *by Thomas McDermott* 76

Pastoral in Blue . . *by Sister Mary Charitos, I.H.M.* 77

Hunter of Souls. A Study of the Life and Spirit of Saint Paul of the Cross . *by Rev. Father Edmund, C.P.* 79

BOOK NOTES 80

Every Pastor, Educator, and Catholic School

should subscribe to

THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

November 1947 contents

- CATHOLIC TEACHERS AND WORLD PEACE
- LEISURE—TIME READING INTERESTS OF CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL BOYS
- SUPERVISION TODAY
- NEEDED: LAY THEOLOGIANS
- PSYCHOLOGY IN THE DAILY LIFE OF THE CHILD
- THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ABSTRACTS
- ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL NOTES
- BOOK REVIEWS

Published monthly except JULY and AUGUST

Subscription Price { United States $3.00 / Foreign $3.50

The Catholic Educational Review

The Catholic University of America Washington 17, D. C.

MONSIGNOR GUILDAY

The obituary notice in the papers last summer, announcing the death of Peter Guilday, was the source of the awakening of memories in the minds of many and the stirring of feelings in the hearts of a lesser number. To the world of historic research it meant the passing of the most prominent worker in the field of American Catholic history. To The Catholic University of America it chronicled the loss of one of its most distinguished professors. To the clergy of the archdiocese of Philadelphia the death was that of a fellow priest who had long been a brilliant member of that clerical body. To the narrower circle of those who were bound to the deceased by the ties of blood or the ties of friendship the news was of that always shocking character which conveys the knowledge that one has departed from visible association whom they loved to claim as a relative or whom they were proud to know as a friend.

The present writer belongs to all three of the categories last enumerated, being a professor of the University in the same faculty with Monsignor Guilday, a fellow diocesan priest of Philadelphia, and a friend of the deceased during forty-five of the sixty-three years of his life, from the time when Peter Guilday presented himself as a youth of eighteen for entrance into St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, till the last day of July, 1947, when Monsignor Guilday was quietly breathing his last in Providence Hospital, in the city of Washington.

Who's Who gives us the dates of his life which furnish the framework of the activities of a career of exceptional brilliance and ceaseless industry. Born in the city of Chester, Pennsylvania, on March 25, 1884, Peter Guilday received his elementary education in St. Michael's parish school of that city, and passed for his secondary training to the Roman Catholic High School, Philadelphia. Graduating as valedictorian of his class in 1901, Peter Guilday went the following year to begin his studies for the priesthood in the Seminary at Overbrook. The writer can well remember the youth with his face beaming with intelligence as he took the entrance examination in the summer of 1902. His career in the seminary gave evidence of the prodigious capacity for work which was to distinguish his academic career. Following

his classes with the success which was indicated by the number of medals which he received at the end of each school year, Mr. Guilday found time to take the classical college course of the University of Pennsylvania. This he did by pursuing by himself the studies outlined in the catalogue of that institution doing all the required reading in his spare hours. Moreover, he was able to co-operate with the late Doctor Herman Heuser in the conduct of *The Dolphin*, a magazine which for some years was a lay companion of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. It was during his seminary period that Peter Guilday first began to write for Catholic periodicals and he often recalled the thrill which he felt when an article of his was accepted by *Ave Maria*.

It was no surprise to his fellow seminarians when, in 1907, at the conclusion of two years of his theological course, it was announced that Mr. Guilday had been selected for study abroad. He was sent to the American College of the University of Louvain, where he was to remain for seven years, except for a brief period of nine months following his ordination, during which he worked as assistant rector of the church of St. Thomas Aquinas, Philadelphia, and of the Cathedral Church of the same city. His priestly ordination came on July 11, 1909, with the imposition of the hands of Bishop Henry Gabriels, the ordinary of Ogdensburg, New York, a native Belgian, who was at the time visiting Brussels. The young priest went for his first Mass to the famous shrine of Lourdes, where he had served as a *brancardier* during vacation as a seminarian.

Returning to the United States for the short stay mentioned above, the young priest enjoyed a considerable reputation as a confessor in the two parishes where he served as curate. But he soon (January, 1911) went back to Louvain for his graduate studies. His directors in the field of history were Cauchie and Van der Essen, Moeller and Brants, with De Wulf, Nys, and Deploige in philosophy, and Maire and Lemain in the auxiliary sciences. It was Monsignor Canon Alfred Cauchie who was his professor *par excellence*, the chief director of his work and the one to whom he constantly referred throughout his life. The young priest learned well the art of research which was to stand him in such good stead when he came to write the biographies of Bishops Carroll and England and of John Gilmary Shea as well as, more proximately, in the writing of his doctoral dissertation, *The*

English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, published by Longmans, Green and Company, in 1914. With the presentation of this dissertation came the degree of *Docteur ès sciences morales et historiques* of the University of Louvain.

During his period of post-graduate study, the young scholar spent a year in research in the libraries and archives of France and Belgium, Spain and Italy. In Rome, he had the privilege of working with Cardinal Ratti, prefect of the Vatican Library, later to become Pope Pius XI. Another year, during which he proceeded with the writing of his dissertation, was spent in London, where he followed a course of lectures on history at the University of London and had some parochial experience in St. Mary's Church, Bayswater. After receiving his degree, Doctor Guilday went to Ireland to initiate investigations of Irish colleges and convents of the days of the Reformation but the outbreak of World War I forced him to renounce the project of a companion volume to his doctoral dissertation and he returned to his native land in October, 1914, after an absence of three years and a half.

It was in the Providence of God that the thirty-three years of Doctor Guilday's priestly life after his post-graduate studies in Louvain were to be spent in academic association with The Catholic University of America. Upon the petition of Monsignor Thomas J. Shahan, rector of the University at the time, the young priest was released from diocesan duties by Archbishop Edmond F. Prendergrast in the autumn of 1914 to become a member of the teaching staff of the University. Beginning with the status of instructor in Church history, he passed through the various grades of the teaching office until, in 1923, he attained the rank of full, or ordinary, professor, with the title of professor of American Church history. For a number of years before his death, he was a member of the academic senate of the institution and often served as representative of the University at functions of other universities and colleges.

To the work of teaching and lecturing, conducting seminars and directing dissertations, the young man added the labor of writing, and monumental works in the field of American Church history remain as a lasting heritage for the scholars of the future. He worked first on a life of Martin Luther but the book remained in manuscript and was never published. Thenceforth he devoted

himself to the story of the Church in the United States, which he told chiefly in the biographies of some of its great protagonists. The first of these was a two-volume life of the first Bishop and Archbishop of Baltimore, John Carroll, which appeared in 1922. Two years later, a history of the Catholic Church in Virginia came as a new product of the pen of the by then widely acclaimed Peter Guilday. It was followed, within two years, by the life of the proto-historian of the Church in the United States, John Gilmary Shea. Only a year passed and the two volumes entitled *The Life and Times of John England* came off the press. Five years later, in 1932, there appeared his history of the Councils of Baltimore. Up to the time of his death, Monsignor Guilday was at work on the life story of another of the great pioneer bishops of the Church in this country, John Hughes, the first Archbishop of New York, a book which unfortunately must remain unfinished.

A catalogue of the writings of Peter Guilday in his chosen field of the history of the Church in the United States, books and articles and reviews, makes an imposing list of *Opera*, testifying to a prodigious amount of research even for the number of years over which his literary activities were spread. His lives of Archbishop Carroll and Bishop England were not intended by the author to be biographies which can be described as popular, so for the ordinary reader they are rather hard going. He had none of the genius of Hilaire Belloc which made that writer's lives of Marie Antoinette and Cardinal Richelieu tales which the reader devoured like novels. Nor had Peter Guilday the gift of weaving into his narrative those points of "human interest" which make a book like Wilfred Ward's *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* such fascinating reading. Monsignor Guilday's volumes were intended for reference and serious study but nevertheless they are erudite without being pedantic and accurate without being merely encyclopaedic. The English is studied without being painfully so, though at times the lofty style of some of the opening paragraphs of the chapters falls to a commonplace level as the narrative proceeds.

In *The Life and Times of Bishop England*, as the title indicates, the author is concerned not only with the story of the first Bishop of Charleston but with the times in which he lived, as John England interested himself greatly in the politics of his age and

the progress of his country. While preparing for this book, Peter Guilday found so much about the "Norfolk Schism" in Virginia, which menaced the Church in this country by its threat to form "an independent Catholic Church" under the jurisdiction of the Jansenist Bishop of Utrecht, that there resulted the volume mentioned above, entitled *The Catholic Church in Virginia, 1815-1822.*

Between the lives of Carroll and England, there also appeared as products of the untiring pen of Doctor Guilday, his *Introduction to Church History* and the *Life of John Gilmary Shea.* The former was designed as a text-book for seminaries and colleges and represents the author's ideas on the study of Church history and his recipe for the training of the ecclesiastical historian in research and interpretation. The latter was a monograph on the famous historian of the Church in the United States. Dr. Guilday played Eliseus to John Gilmary Shea's Elias, for it is generally recognized that the mantle of the author of the four volumes, *The History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, fell on the shoulders of Peter Guilday. No list of Guildayana, however summary, can omit the volume entitled *A History of the Councils of Baltimore 1791-1884*, which appeared in 1932. This book is the story of the development of canonical legislation for the United States from that small group which made up the National Synod of 1791 through the increasingly larger assemblies of the seven provincial councils of Baltimore and the three plenary, or national, councils, culminating in that magnificent gathering of the hierarchy, which was the Third Plenary Council, that of 1884.

The services of Monsignor Guilday to the cause of American Catholic history are represented not only by his scholarly books and his learned articles and by his work in the class-room and in the direction of doctoral dissertations at The Catholic University but by two foundations, both designed to stimulate interest in his chosen subject and keep that interest alive. These two are *The Catholic Historical Review*, a quarterly journal whose first issue was that of April, 1915, and the *American Catholic Historical Association*, which grew out of the American Historical Association, in December, 1919. Both of these important agencies for the preservation of the records of the life of the Church in America owe their existence to Peter Guilday. Of the periodical he was for years the editor-in-chief, and even when his impaired health

forced him to give up active editorial duties in connection with it, he continued to the time of his death to lend its directors his counsel and criticism. The national society for the work of Catholic history in America, the A. C. H. A., owes not only its birth to Doctor Guilday but for the twenty-one years of his active association with it he was its guiding spirit. He wisely preserved the bond with the American Historical Association by annual meetings in joint session with that parent society, with the result of pleasant and profitable relations between Catholic historians and their secular brethren.

As a professor at the University, Doctor Guilday was distinguished by the personal interest which he took in his students. He was not satisfied that the roster of his classes be simply a list of names but he took pains to become really acquainted with the bearers of those names. This was especially true of the smaller groups which made up his seminars and his elective classes. The inspiration and enlightenment of his pupils was both a conscientious task and a labor of love on the part of their teacher. His seminar was an interesting experience for all of its members and the notes taken in his classes of bibliography would make a comprehensive historiography of the Church in America. Fortunate were those who majored under Doctor Guilday, and the catalogue of the many who worked with him for their Ph.D. (and there were some few also for the S.T.D.) includes many names prominent in Catholic education in this country, priests, nuns, and laymen. These Catholic historians of the future profited by the technical training of their teacher, from his initiation into the study of history under Charles H. McCarthy in the Roman Catholic High School, Philadelphia, to his final indoctrination at the hands of Alfred Cauchie, in the University of Louvain. Reference is here made to that early apprenticeship, as Doctor McCarthy lived to see his gifted young pupil serve for a number of years with him as a fellow member of the teaching staff of The Catholic University.

It was, however, his personal interest in his students which most impressed the writer of this article. Groups, meeting for scholastic purposes, would be entertained by Doctor Guilday in the house which he kept for his mother at 1234 Monroe Street, Brookland. Even when, on the death of his mother, he gave up his house and came to live on campus, in Curley Hall, these

social gatherings of his students were not entirely abandoned. His seminar had a social evening in his quarters on the last meeting of each season; and every year, on St. Charles' Day, November 4, Doctor Guilday was host to all the alumni of St. Charles' Seminary, Overbrook, who were identified with the University as professors or students.

Among the contributions of Monsignor Guilday to the literature of American Catholic history mention should not be omitted of his sermons on the occasion of a number of important centennial and other anniversaries. Prominent among these was his sermon at the Pontifical Mass in the Stadium of The Catholic University, on May 30, 1932, for the Bi-Centennary of George Washington, a discourse which was published under the title, *George Washington, His Catholic Friends and Allies.* Two years later, on Decoration Day of 1934, he pronounced another memorable discourse at the celebration in Baltimore commemorating the three hundred years of the Church in the United States. A sermon at Conewago Chapel, in Adams County, Pennsylvania, on May 21, 1937, told the story of the early Jesuit missions out of Maryland, the occasion being the bi-centennial of the founding of the mission in Conewago. Later the same year, September 19, Monsignor Guilday was the preacher at the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, in his native home, Doughoregan Manor, near Baltimore, a tribute to "America's greatest Catholic layman."

While not a "popular" preacher, Doctor Guilday was a forceful talker and a fluent speaker, of good voice and presence, and masterful in his use of English. His sermons, however, were too long and too heavily freighted with historical fact to hold the attention of the ordinary congregation. Printed, they make excellent essays, more easily read than listened to. One exception to this general statement must be made in favor of the series of devotional discourses, delivered in the church of Our Lady of Lourdes, New York City, for the exercise of the Three Hours on Good Friday, 1916, when the preacher was a young priest and just beginning his career at the University. These sermons were subsequently published in a little volume, under the title of *Three Hours' Agony of Our Lord Jesus.*

The satisfaction which comes to every successful teacher in observing the progress of his students was supplemented in the

case of Monsignor Guilday by the evidence of the widespread appreciation of his work represented by the honorary degrees conferred upon him by universities and colleges. Notre Dame gave him the LL.D. in 1925. Marquette made him L.H.D. in 1929. A year later, Georgetown invested him with the insignia of the J.U.D. The last of his academic hoods came to him from Fordham University, in 1940, on the occasion of the centennial of that institution. A distinction which the recipient treasured highly was his election, in 1924, as a fellow of the Royal Historical Society of England. Only two years after, he was decorated by the King of the Belgians with the Order of Leopold II in recognition of his work in connection with the restoration of the library of the University of Louvain. The Holy See placed the seal of its approval on the services on Doctor Guilday when, in February of 1935, he was named a domestic prelate of His Holiness with the title of Right Reverend Monsignor. He received the distinctive robes of his new honor from Bishop James H. Ryan, then rector of the Catholic University. The ceremony took place in the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, on the campus of the University, Solemn Mass in the Dominican rite being celebrated by one of the new Monsignor's students, the late Rev. Dr. Boniface Stratemeier, O.P., and the sermon was delivered by Monsignor George Johnson, rector of the Cathedral of Portland, Maine.

To those who were privileged to know the Monsignor personally, he was a kindly and lovable man. The colored maids who took care of his rooms in Curley Hall and the students who volunteered to bring him his meals during the final years of his life when his disability prevented him from going to the dining hall in Curley Hall will bear testimony to his kindness and consideration. The Knights of Columbus of the city of Washington, for whom he acted as chaplain for a number of years, and in whose activities he always took the liveliest interest, will remember him, not only as the scholarly man whom they admired but as the genial priest whom they loved. The Sisters of Divine Providence, who are in charge of domestic arrangements for the priest professors living in Caldwell and Curley Halls of the University, were devoted to Monsignor Guilday and gave evidence of their regard for him by numerous little attentions when he was a shut-in in his own quarters. The priests of the University en-

joyed paying visits to him during that same period and were edified by his patient bearing of his physical handicaps and his unflagging interest in national and academic questions.

The last decade of the life of Monsignor Guilday was one of declining health. Diabetic disturbances brought on impaired vision and finally culminated in the loss of a limb, which confined him to his apartment for the final two and a half years of his life. He continued to work as professor despite this disability and conducted classes and seminars in his own quarters up to the end of the semester which preceded his death. He was always uncomplaining and, as we see it now, over-optimistic concerning his condition of health, so that it was a surprise even to his intimate friends when he went to the hospital, in July of last year, apparently only for a routine "check-up," to learn that his body was too frail to withstand the ravages of the pneumonia which developed and that death was imminent. The end came on the afternoon of July 31, 1947, after several days of coma.

Monsignor Guilday's detailed instructions of arrangements for his funeral were characteristic of the humble man he really was. He requested burial from the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception and interment in the University plot of Mount Olivet Cemetery, in Washington. The Requiem was to be a low Mass and there was to be no eulogy. Accordingly, the Monday following his death, August 4, the Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia, J. Carroll McCormick, representing Cardinal Dougherty, his Ordinary, celebrated the Low Mass of Requiem for the funeral in the Shrine. The Monsignor's cherished Knights of Columbus formed a guard of honor, standing watch, night and day, beside his bier throughout the period between his death and funeral. At the express request of the deceased, his modest casket bore the simple inscription, "Peter Guilday, 1884-1947" without designation of his prelatial rank or initials of his academic honors.

It is difficult to write, at this early date, an appreciation of the life of Monsignor Guilday. One feels that he will rank with the most distinguished men ever associated with the Catholic University of America, with Keane and Bouquillon, with Shahan and Pace, with Thomas Shields and John A. Ryan. In the world of historical research, concerning the Church in the United States, Peter Guilday stood preeminent. His lifelong *bête noire* was the cavalier attitude of European historians towards American

Catholic history. He frequently gave expression to his displeasure with what he called their myopia with relation to things of the United States, which resulted either in their neglect of the story of the Church in America or their inaccuracies with regard to it due to careless investigation. Monsignor Guilday was a real university man. He was interested in everything concerning university education and deeply critical of institutions which failed to give their best attention to graduate work. As John Tracy Ellis remarked in his article on Monsignor Guilday in the issue of *The Catholic Historical Review* for October, 1947: "It is easy enough to set down the bare record of Peter Guilday's deeds for Catholic historical scholarship. It is not so simple to do justice to their full import and significance for the Catholic Church of the United States." Who can measure the result of the enthusiasm for the study of history with which he inspired those who sat under him and especially those who worked with him for their master's and doctor's degrees? Who can chronicle the effect of his intimate knowledge of the sources of history and his up-to-the-minute acquaintance with the latest publications in the field? Who can estimate the result of the conscientious exactness of detail which he demanded of his students? Who will be able to set down in words his influence on the whole world of the writing of American Catholic history as exemplified in the books of his former pupils as they published their biographies of Catholic leaders, clerical and lay, and their sketches of the progress of Catholicity in individual dioceses and parishes, in various states and cities?

Cardinal Newman, in one of his sermons, gives expression to the thought that a portrait rarely satisfies the intimate friends of the subject, however faithful a likeness it may be in the judgment of strangers. One can outline the cassock of the priest and paint the purple of the robes of the prelate or the scarlet of the toga of the professor but to depict the lineaments of the face and the expression of the eyes demands such intimate knowledge and consummate technique that the result is seldom satisfactory even to the artist himself. With discouraging sentiments such as these did the present writer approach the task of penning some of his memories and setting down his appreciation of Monsignor Guilday. Thousands share the memory of the deceased as a scholarly writer, preeminent in the domain of Catholic history, or as a

gifted professor, of whom the Catholic University was justly proud. Hundreds cherish the memory of him as pupils of their teacher, graduate students of their directing master. Hundreds more knew him as a public figure in the ecclesiastical and academic world. Perhaps a score will remember him as a distinguished kinsman, as they were his brothers and sisters, his nieces and nephews. The little group of those who knew Peter Guilday long and intimately will keep the memory not so much of the historian and professor, for with them Monsignor Guilday, the erudite author and University savant, will be eclipsed by Peter Guilday, the priest and the man. Their most indelible recollections will not be of the nationally known figure of the twenties and thirties but of the invalid of 1944 to 1947, carrying on his work of teaching and writing with unabated zeal, cheerful and uncomplaining despite his physical handicaps, an unforgettable lesson in Christian fortitude and Christian resignation.

Poenas cucurrit fortiter et sustulit viriliter.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

MYSTERIUM GRATIAE

The mystery is here. The very fact of resistance against sufficient prevenient grace is already an evil, a deficiency. It cannot come from God, but only from our own defectibility, or from the deficient secondary cause. On the contrary, the fact of non-resistance to prevenient sufficient grace is itself a good. Then it does not come from ourselves alone, but also and above all from God, the Cause of all good. The mystery remains then: why then does God permit one person to resist His advances while He gives another the grace not to resist? This is the mystery which St. Augustine thus expressed: *"Quare hunc trahat, et illum non trahat, noli velle dijudicare, si non vis errare."*

—Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, in *Le sens du mystère et le clair-obscur intellectuel* (Paris: Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie., 1934), p. 293.

BROWNSON'S TECHNIQUE IN APOLOGETICS

There are some who count Orestes Brownson as a Catholic apologist second to none in the age in which he lived. A man of extensive and diversified learning, he defended the Church on all fronts—the theological, the philosophical, the political, the literary, and the scientific. But inasmuch as the major part of the nineteenth century was an era of great political turmoil and widespread discussion of forms of government, Brownson had perhaps more frequent occasion to meet the assailants of the Church on political than other grounds.

One of the popular political objections to the Church in the nineteenth century—in fact since 1789—was that the Church is incompatible with the democratic form of government. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when the age was monarchical, James I of England wrote (1617) his *Remonstrance for the Divine Right of Kings and the Independency of their Crowns* in answer to the speech of Cardinal Duperron in the *États Généraux* of France. The king objected to the Papacy, and therefore to the Catholic Church, on the grounds that it is incompatible with kingly government. The pope claimed to be superior to kings, held them subject to his spiritual authority, and consequently denied the independence of their crowns. But when the spirit of the times changed from the monarchical to the democratic temper, beginning with the French Revolution, then the great objection to the Church was that she denies popular sovereignty, and is incompatible with democratic or republican government. Numberless anti-papal journals, pamphlets, preachers and lecturers were briskly operative creating the impression—especially among the middle and lower classes of American society—that the predominance of the Church in this country would destroy our free institutions, and prove the grave of civil and religious liberty. Such an impression could only erect a formidable barrier to the spread of Catholicity in the country, and as an apologist Brownson was ready to break a lance or two in the interest of truth.

Many other controversialists of the day also took notice of this unpatriotic charge against Catholics, but what is most worthy of note in Brownson's answer to the charge is the tech-

nique he employed. While other apologists assumed only sectarian ground in being content to show merely that Catholicism is in harmony with the American Constitution or Republic—thus unwittingly making the Republic the touchstone of all truth natural and supernatural—Brownson assumed higher ground, stoutly maintaining that religion, if anything at all, is the supreme law of life, and that therefore one must conform his politics to his religion and not his religion to his politics. Religion being ultimate rather than politics, he asserted, no political theory or form of government is ever to be admitted as a test or standard by which religion is to be tried.

> Religion if anything, is for man the supreme law, and must take precedence of everything else; and the very idea of a Church, is that of an institution founded by Almighty God, for the purpose of introducing and sustaining the supremacy of law in the government of human affairs. If religion and politics are opposed, politics, not religion, must give way. No man, I care not who he is, whether a Catholic or Protestant, a pagan or a Mohametan, if he has any conception of religion at all, denies, or can deny, that he should place his religion first, and that all else in life should be subordinated to it. He who denies that his religion should govern his politics, as well as his actions, virtually denies morality, denies the divine law, and asserts political atheism. To subject his religion to his politics, or to object to religion because incompatible with this or that political theory, is, in principle, to deny the sovereignty of God himself, and fall below the most degrading form of gentilism.[1]

Without, then, admitting in any sense the legitimacy of the aforesaid objection, or in the least subordinating his religion to his politics, Brownson made formal reply to the unpatriotic charge against Catholics in three elaborate articles: "Catholicity Necessary to sustain Popular Liberty,"[2] "The Church and the Republic; Or, The Church Necessary to the Republic, And the Republic compatible with the Church,"[3] and, after the Vatican Council, "The Papacy and the Republic."[4] In the first of these articles he demonstrates that the unassisted virtue and intelligence of the people are insufficient to sustain democracy or popular liberty. After showing that neither education nor the

[1] *Brownson's Works*, 20 Vols. (Detroit, 1883-1887), XII, 2.

[2] Cf. *ibid.*, X, 1.

[3] Cf. *ibid.*, XII, 1.

[4] Cf. *ibid.*, XIII, 326.

press can adequately supply the required augmentation of virtue and intelligence in the case, he proceeded further to demonstrate that only religion can supply the want, and at that a religion that is entirely free and independent of popular control, over and above the people, speaking from on high and able to command them—which is the Catholic religion alone. The second article is really a composite of two lectures which he had delivered in Broadway Tabernacle in New York City and were afterwards published in his *Review* by request. In this article he shows from a review of European history that society when left to itself is exposed to two opposite dangers: on the one hand, to a tendency to absolutism of the state, and on the other, to a tendency to the absolutism of the individual; that is, to a tendency to social despotism, and a tendency to pure individualism or anarchy. To save society from these two dangers a third element is needed to mediate between the two, and that saving element is religion. But only that religion will answer the purpose which rests on a basis entirely independent both of the nation and the individual, and is higher than either, an *organic* power which neither the national authority nor the individual authority can control, but is strong enough to restrain either from encroaching on the rights of the other. Only the Catholic religion can answer the purpose.

In the third article, "The Papacy and the Republic," after making clear that the state or secular authority has no basis or ground on which to stand except in the spiritual, he marshalled in still more elaborate and detailed form the arguments he had used in the first article on the subject, excoriating in particular the tidal wave of divorce that threatens to engulf the nation in ruin, and against which the Catholic Church stands as a lone bulwark. His preface to the treatise is worthy of note:

> I cannot do the dishonor to Jesus Christ, my Lord and God, whose vicar on earth is the pope, of undertaking to prove that the papacy is compatible with the republican or any other form of government. I take higher ground and assert that, without the papacy or the Catholic Church, which is essentially papal, the republican or democratic form of government has nothing to stand on, and is and must be an impracticable government. No civil government, be it a monarchy, an aristocracy, a democracy, or any possible combination of any two or all of them, can be a wise, just, efficient, and durable government, governing for the good of the community, without the Catholic Church; and without the papacy there is and can be no Catholic Church. This is true of

any civil government, but especially true of a republican or democratic form of government like ours.[5]

Brownson's technique in religious controversy was no less expert and sagacious. Too many Catholic controversialists have allowed themselves to be kept forever busy explaining some doctrine or refuting some objection urged by the adversaries of the Church. To Brownson all this was a fatal error. To him the only questions to be settled are: did our Lord actually found a church with authority to teach? and, if so, is this church the Catholic Church or some other? Once it is established that the Catholic Church is the Church Christ founded, all debate on particular questions is foreclosed. All objections or arguments urged against such an authority are and must be futile and unavailing.

However, it will not do for the adversaries of the Church to begin by a simple denial that Christ, Our Lord, established a church. *For the simple historical existence of the Church*, stretching in unbroken succession from the time of the Apostles to the present moment, asserting herself to be the Church of Christ, received as such for fifteen hundred years by nearly all Christendom, and still received as such by the overwhelming majority of all those bearing the Christian name, puts the Church in possession. But possession in law is *prima facie* evidence of title. It will not do then to call upon the Church to produce her titles that she is the Church of Christ; because the question is not, shall the Catholic Church be admitted to be the Church of Christ? but, shall she be declared to be *not* the Church of Christ? It is not a question of *putting* the Church in possession, but of *ousting* her from a possession she holds and has held from the beginning, and for the greater part of the time without any serious opposition. It is not a question of admitting the title of the Church, but of impeaching it.

The *onus probandi* is, therefore, on the shoulders of the party contesting it. It is for them to show good and valid reasons for setting aside the title of the Church, and ejecting her from her possession. A government de facto is, presumptively, a government de jure, and must be respected as such, till it is proved not to be. The Roman Catholic Church is unquestionably the Church of Christ de facto, and is therefore to be presumed to be His de jure, till evidence is produced which convicts her of usurpation.[6]

---

[5] *Ibid.*, XIII, 328.

[6] *Ibid.*, V, 469.

Nor will it do to attempt to unchurch the Church by quoting the Sacred Scriptures, for they are an integral part of the Church in possession. From the very beginning she has been their legal keeper and expounder. Adversaries cannot, therefore, legitimately quote the Scriptures as the word of God against her, save in the sense she authorizes, unless they succeed in removing the presumption she derives in law from prescription, and getting themselves legal possession of them. The Church admits that the Scriptures, taken in the sense she authorizes, are the word of God. This is the full extent of her admission. But taken in another sense, she denies them to be the word of God; for the word of God is not the mere letters, but the sense intended by the Holy Ghost. Consequently, before one can allege them in a sense contrary to hers, nay, before one can go into an inquiry as to their sense, one must, on the one hand, dispossess her of her prescriptive right to declare their sense, and establish one's own authority as their legal interpreter. Till one or the other has been done, the sense of the Scriptures is not an open question, and cannot be opened without assuming the point in dispute. It is unquestionably a very difficult matter, Brownson remarked, to make an action lie against the Church, or to find any court in which an action can legally be commenced against her.[7]

There are two ways, however, Brownson acknowledged, in which it is possible for the assailants of the Church to impeach her title. The one is to convict her of having contradicted in her teaching some known principle of reason; the other is to convict her of having contradicted herself, that is, of having taught doctrines which mutually contradict one another. For no church could be from God that teaches, as the word of God, any doctrine which contradicts a known principle of reason. But a known *principle* of reason is to be emphasized in the case.

> A doctrine may be repugnant to our feelings, it may run athwart our prejudices, fancies, or caprices, and therefore seem to us very unreasonable, and yet contradict no known *principle* of reason. To be *above* reason is not necessarily to be *against* reason. The Church has unquestionably taught, and continues to teach, doctrines which are above reason, and concerning the truth or falsity of which reason has nothing to say; but no doctrine which contradicts any known principle of reason.[8]

---

[7] *Ibid.*. VI, 292 ff.

[8] *Ibid.*, V, 473.

Nor can the Church be convicted of any real instance of a contradiction of herself, or a variation in her doctrine. This is a thing that even her most learned and subtle enemies have never been, and never will be able, to do. Much less has she ever taught doctrines which are actually self-contradictory. "Even her enemies are struck with the systematic consistency of her teaching. The infidel Saint-Simon declares that her catechism and her prayers are the most profoundly systematic works ever written."[9]

Such rigid argumentation in religious controversy is scarcely calculated to win outsiders to a sympathetic notice or study of the claims of the Church. Indeed, as Brownson himself said, controversy is not the genius of Christianity. However, it seems a part of the designs of Providence that to the strong Brownson was to fall the special mission of putting down hostility to the Church in America through a vigorous, crystal-clear demonstration of the reasonableness of an acceptance of the Church and her teaching. His highest gifts were no doubt adapted rather to that end than to the direct winning of converts. And he came to the Church at precisely that time (1884) when the Church was encountering a frontal attack on a wide scale. In his *The Protestant Crusade*, R. A. Billington says: "By the middle of the 1840's the American churches were able to present a virtually united front against Catholicism. Swept away by the pleas of organized nativists, they had accepted the challenge to make America the scene of a new Reformation in which Popery would be driven from the land and the work of Luther and Calvin brought to a successful end."[10] To meet the challenge, Brownson on his conversion to the Church engaged at once in controversy with the organs of the various Protestant demoninations. The arguments advanced in defense of the Church by this "Hercules of American controversy" remain unanswered to this day. Those arguments, when rightly presented, are of course in very truth unanswerable, but if any one were needed to present them in their most forcible form, that man was Brownson. Van Wyck Brooks gives it as his opinion that Brownson never had in this country opponents of a sufficiently formidable calibre to bring "his great powers into full play." But accepting what opponents were at hand, no corner escaped his eye in which error might lurk. Though asserting it on

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938), p. 181.

a slightly different score, Msgr. Matthew Smith, founder and editor of *The Denver Register*, has said that it is to Brownson "we owe the peaceful career of the Church in America."

When discussing for the advantage of young Catholic aspirants to artistic excellence the canons of literary and aesthetic critisism, Brownson maintained that all art and literature, to be true art or literature, must be capable of abiding the test of Catholic doctrine and morals.

> We prize literature and art only as they subserve Christian doctrine and morals. Apart from these, they have little value in our eyes; for so considered they cease to be genuinely artistic, and have at best merely the form, without the substance, of art. We esteem no literature which treats of things in their generality, without touching anything in their speciality, for the general without the special is mere possibility; and we belong to that class of moralists who hold that every human action is either moral or immoral, either good or bad, and that no human action is ever morally indifferent. To us the end is no less important than the principle, and the philosophy that denies the final cause. is as altruistic and assured as that which denies the first cause. Our theology determines our ethics, and our ethics determine our aesthetics. Theology is the queen of the sciences, and they have no rights or reasons of existence but to be employed in her service. Art in its most general sense is simply the application of science to practical life. Hence we are always obliged, whether we are reviewing a work of art or science, to review it under its relation to Catholicity, and to judge it by its bearing on Catholic doctrine and morals.[11]

He owned that such a mode of reviewing was quite unfashionable, being generally regarded as narrow, illiberal, and bigoted:

> It is in our days thought to be a mark of wisdom to deny the unity and universality both of the first and the final cause of the universe, to separate philosophy from theology, truth from revelation, Christianity from the Church, morality from religion, and art, or, as it is improperly called aesthetics, from morality. But this is a fact not quite to the credit of the age. Catholicity, in the order of ideas or principles, is the truth and the whole truth, whether the truth evident to natural reason, or the truth revealed and affirmed to us by supernatural authority. It therefore necessarily extends to every department of thought, feeling, and action. Nothing, then, in any order, or under any relation, is really separable from it, exempted from its law, or commendable save as inspired by it and as it conforms to it. Falsehood either as to the prin-

---

[11] *Works*, XIX, 318.

ciple or as to the end is never commendable, and moral deformity is no less repugnant to the beautiful than physical deformity. The *Wahlverwandtschaften,* or *Elective Affinities,* of Goethe is as offensive to good taste as shocking to the moral sense.[12]

He then went on to explain why it is the very nature of things that art, to be true art, must be capable of abiding the test of Catholic doctrine and morals. In doing so, however, he made plain—in order to prevent misconception—that in bringing every work to the rigid test of Catholic doctrine and morals, he did not wish to exclude from trial all works not works of orthodox and practical Catholics.

We find in Plato and Aristotle much sound philosophy; no little beauty in the ancient Greek and Roman classics; and some in the masterpieces of poetry, music, and eloquence of modern Protestant and infidel nations. This is because all nations, ancient and modern, even the heretical and corrupt, have some rays of truth and goodness from the Catholic sun furrowing their darkness. What we admire in the philosophy or art of heterodox nations and individuals is precisely that in them which conforms to Catholic doctrine and morals, and which has been inspired by those elements of Catholicity which they have retained after their lapse into heterodoxy and infidelity.[13]

In his biography of Brownson, *A Pilgrim's Progress*, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., remarks Brownson's "sharp perception of the limitations of science as being rare in a day which tended to confound Newton with God."[14] In taking notice of the reputed antagonism between faith and science, Brownson repudiated the naïve argument that science is instantly false the moment it comes into conflict with religion. He regarded the quarrel not as between faith and science, but between the opinions and conjectures of scientists and those of theologians. But only the Catholic divine, Brownson pointed out, has a sure footing in the controversy, for he alone has the infallible teaching authority of the Church to test all theories, hypotheses, and conjectures of scientists. If any theory or hypothesis of the scientist comes athwart the teaching voice of the Church it is to be at once pronounced false and unscientific. But, as Brownson observed when reviewing in 1874 a series of lectures by Joseph LeConte, Professor of Geology and Natural History in the University of

[12] *Ibid.*, XIX, 319.

[13] *Ibid.*, XIX, 320.

[14] (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1939), p. 263

California, the non-Catholic or Protestant divine has no such criterion of truth to bring as a touchstone to the domain of science. For the Protestant divine has no sure or infallible means of determining the sense of divine revelation since he rejects in the church the very idea of an infallible teaching authority. He is thereby shorn of all hope or ability to determine what is false and unscientific in science when it comes in apparent conflict with religion—the very thing Professor Le Conte had so unsuccessfully attempted to do in his lectures.[15]

Brownson thought that this inability on the part of Protestant divines to oppose anything more than mere opinion in matters of religion to the false pretensions of pseudo-science brought religion into disrepute with scientists and tended to emancipate science from theology.

> In the general quarrel of scientists and Protestant theologians the scientists have carried the day, hate for the most part emancipated themselves from theology, and proceeded without attempting to reckon with theologians. They even make it a point to ignore them, and to treat their reclamations with silent contempt. The Protestant theologians, having no infallible authority for theology, and unable to help themselves, gradually fall in with the scientists, adopt their theories, and try to explain the Scriptures so as to make them accord with their theories.[16]

When reviewing in 1875 Professor John Tyndall's "Inaugural Address before the British Association" on the progress of science, Brownson complained in particular of James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., President of Princeton College—the Presbyterians' outstanding man of the day—that in replying to Tyndall he "concedes so much to the atheistic school, that he reserves nothing worth defending against it."[17] He had also previously complained of President McCosh on a slightly different score when taking notice of McCosh's lectures in defense of Christianity against Positivism.

> We complain of the author for the indignity he offers Christianity by suffering the Positivists to put it on the defensive, and in attempting to prove it against Positivism. Christianity is in possession, and she is not called upon to defend her title till strong reasons are adduced for ousting her. Consequently, it is for those who would oust her to prove their case, to make good their cause. The Christian controversialist

---

[15] *Works*, III, 519. [16] *Ibid.*, III, 534. [17] *Ibid.*, IX, 546.

at this late day does not begin with an apology or defense of Christianity, but attacks those who assail her, and puts them on their defense. It is for the scientists, or Positivists, who oppose the Christian religion, to prove their Positivism or science. It is enough for the Christian religion to show that Positivism or alleged science is not itself proven, or, if proven, that it proves nothing against Christ and his Church.[18]

Though doing so in a reverential tone and manner, Brownson also differed on this head from Cardinal Wiseman when reviewing the Cardinal's *Lectures on the Connection between Science and Religion*. His Eminence was more condescending to scientists than Brownson, and attempted to prove to them that the objections which they brought against religion from pseudo-science were not scientific. Brownson, on the contrary, planted himself stoutly on the principle that those who bring objections against religion from science must prove, first of all, that what they allege is genuine science, not merely an induction, a theory, an hypothesis, or a conjecture. "We hold," he asserted, "that Christians should plant themselves on the rights of religion, and yield in these times, even by way of argument, no advantage which they may justly claim. History and science must plead before her [the Church], not she before them."[19]

The impression might be gained from what has been said that Brownson was not merely illiberal but positively hostile in his attitude toward scientist. The fact of the matter is that while he had a profound regard for the true scientist, he was decidedly hostile toward the whole class of modern anti-christian scientists and arraigned them scathingly before the bar of moral accountability. No man, he maintained, has the moral right to publish any theory or hypothesis which assails or contradicts the Christian faith unless he has infallible authority for the truth of what he alleges in opposition to it—a thing that no scientist has or can have.

From the point of view of morals or tried by a rigidly ethical standard, such scientists as Darwin, Sir Charles Lyell, Sir John Lubbock, Taine, Büchner, Professor Huxley, Herbert Spencer, and others of the same genus, who publish opinions, theories, hypotheses, which are at best only plausible conjectures under the imposing name of science, and which unsettle men's minds, bewilder the half-learned, mislead the ignorant, undermine the best basis of society, and assail the whole moral

[18] *Ibid.*, II, 430.

[19] *Ibid.*, IX, 458 ff.

order of the universe, are fearfully guilty, and a thousand times more dangerous to society and greater criminals even than your most noted thieves, robbers, burglars, swindlers, murderers, or midnight assassins. Instead of being held in honor, feted, and lauded as the great men of their age and country, and held up as the benefactors of the race, they richly deserve that public opinion should brand them with infamy as the enemies of God and man, of religion and society, of truth and justice, of science and civilization.[20]

In grappling with some of the most subtle problems in the mazes of philosophy, Brownson encountered not a few of the fiercest intellectual battles of his long and stormy career, particularly in the field of epistemology. Though bold and intrepid as a frontiersman of thought, none could have been more docile or more ready to listen to the faintest whisper of authority should any opinion or theory advanced by him come athwart in any way the teachings of faith.

On entering the Church Brownson was overjoyed at finding at last an authority that could give him security against error. He had had much sad experience with error in its multiple forms as he perseveringly picked his way through various systems of thought both of the ancient and modern world until he was finally led, humanly speaking, along the road of philosophy to the threshold of the Church. "The convert feels," he said, "an unfailing support, and no longer fears that he is in danger every step he takes of having his footing give way and of falling through."[21] Becoming once sure of his ground, Brownson became an utterly fearless critic. In God's revelation to man through the Catholic Church, he found the standard, the only standard, by which life and literature in its various branches can be adequately judged.

THOMAS R. RYAN, C.PP.S.

Precious Blood Mission House
New Cumberland, Pa.

[20] *Ibid.*, IX, 495 f.

[21] *Ibid.*, VIII, 380.

MISSION INTENTION

"That the Catholic Church May Be Better Known in Japan" is the Mission Intention for the Month of January, 1948.

"IF THE TRUMPET GIVE AN UNCERTAIN SOUND"

In the early part of 1947, Dr. Edward J. Jurji, Associate Professor of Islamics and Comparative Religion at Princeton University, edited a symposium of religious thought, to which nine writers contributed.[1] The work is intended to explain in a clear and objective manner the chief beliefs and ceremonial worship of what are regarded as the major contemporary religions. The ten forms of religion selected for this study are Confucianism, Taoism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Shintoism, Islam, Judaism, Eastern Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The amount of space devoted to each essay ranges from twenty pages for Taoism to sixty pages for Judaism. The article on Catholicism covers thirty pages. The publishers claim that each essay is written simply and objectively by an eminent scholar, with the authority that is the fruit of a lifetime study of his subject. They express hope that the book will be helpful to a wide variety of readers, including historians, philosophers and clergymen.

The work in general has little to offer that is profitable or interesting to the average Catholic. He is fully convinced that through the goodness of God he possesses the one true faith; he realizes that the Catholic religion affords adequate motives of credibility, adapted to the most brilliant intelligence as well as to the simplest mind. His knowledge of the strength and stability of the Catholic Church for the past twenty centuries, while it proclaimed unequivocally its exclusive possession of a divine mandate to teach all men, enables him to perceive the utter fallacy of the following statement, found in the essay on Islam:

> It is becoming increasingly clear that no religion claiming a divine mandate to serve the purpose of God for mankind can long endure unless it leaves man's conscience absolutely free to choose the kind of spiritual worship and religious affiliation which best agrees with his inmost understanding of the eternal truth.[2]

And an intelligent Catholic would deem it sheer nonsense to ascribe any serious religious significance to the following "experience" described by the author of the essay on Taoism as a beautifully expressed illustration of Chinese mysticism:

[1] *The Great Religions of the Modern World.* Edited by Edward J. Jurji, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1947. Pp. v+387. $3.75.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 222.

> Once upon a time I dreamt I was a butterfly, fluttering hither and thither, to all intents and interests and purposes a butterfly. I was conscious of following my fancies as a butterfly, and was unconscious of my individuality as a man. Suddenly I awaked, and there I lay, myself again. Now, I do not know whether I was then a man dreaming I was a butterfly, or whether I am now a butterfly dreaming I am a man.[3]

However, one portion of this work is of interest from the Catholic standpoint—the essay on Catholicism. One who is invited to contribute to a religious symposium an extensive article on the beliefs and practices of Catholicism has the opportunity of bringing to the notice of many enjoying little or no contact with Catholics a clear and logical explanation of the doctrine and worship of the Catholic Church. One who is given such an opportunity should make every effort to explain simply, yet thoroughly, all the fundamental tenets of the Catholic faith, particularly those which are most frequently misunderstood or impugned, or which are the subject of current controversy. Every equivocation, every attempt to gloss over doctrines that are likely to be unsavory to non-Catholics, every endeavor to minimize tenets not in accord with "modern thought" must be scrupulously avoided. To employ terminology that is common among non-Catholics but does not accurately and adequately present Catholic belief is inexcusable, even though it might win a measure of good-will and esteem from the readers. In a word, when a Catholic is requested to explain the doctrine of Catholicism to non-Catholics desirous of learning just what the Catholic Church teaches he must propose Catholic truth in its entirety, with the greatest possible measure of clarity and simplicity.

It is regrettable that the essay on Roman Catholicism which appears in the book under consideration from the pen of Fr. Gerald G. Walsh, S. J. notably fails to measure up to this standard. If the issue were limited to this particular symposium, a brief book review pointing out this defect would suffice. But the essay in question represents a tendency, which is unfortunately favored by some modern Catholic writers and speakers, to abandon the direct, clear, complete presentation of the Church's beliefs that has been traditional among Catholics, in favor of vague and ambiguous phrases and even to suppress certain phases of the Church's teachings—apparently for the purpose of

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

winning the good will of non-Catholics. Accordingly, a criticism in the form of an article is being presented in the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* so that the question may be more thoroughly discussed and the discussion may come to the attention of the greatest possible number of our readers. The point at issue here should be seriously considered by every priest who, in the course of his ministry, is called on to explain the Catholic faith to non-Catholics. And the comments passed on the statements found in this essay are to be understood as directed, not merely against the method employed in this particular symposium, but rather against any mode of expounding Catholic belief that lacks the proper clarity, accuracy, directness, and completeness.

It is a fundamental Catholic dogma, defined by the Council of the Vatican, that Christ immediately and directly promised to, and conferred on, St. Peter the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church.[4] The author of the essay we are discussing, after quoting the words of the famous promise of Christ to Simon Bar-Jona related by St. Matthew (16:16) makes this comment: "Jesus appointed him [Peter] to a very special position in the hierarchy of the Church.[5] Such an exposition could easily be harmonized with the view that Peter was granted only a primacy of honor. It is true, in several parts of the essay mention is made of the primacy of papal authority, but no attempt is made at any further explanation. And the only allusion to the doctrine of papal infallibility—that tenet of the Catholic faith that is so widely misunderstood and so frequently denounced—is the statement that it was defined by the Vatican Council.[6]

It is a basic doctrine of Catholic teaching that the sacraments give grace *ex opere operato*—which, in theological language, means that they are true instrumental causes of grace, subordinate to the power of God, the principal cause. Their efficacy does not depend on the dispositions of the recipient, these being required only to the extent that no impediment be placed to the effects of the sacrament. The Catholic doctrine of the efficacy of the sacraments was solemnly defined by the Council of Trent as one of its most important dogmatic declarations against the

[4] *DB*, 1822.

[5] *The Great Religions of the Modern World*, p. 308.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 330.

notions of the Reformers, particularly the Lutheran idea that the sacraments merely stir up faith in the recipient, and that by virtue of this faith he is justified.[7] It is very difficult to see how anyone can derive anything like an accurate idea of the Catholic doctrine from the single sentence that is intended to explain the efficacy of the sacraments in the essay we are considering: "Outward symbols and inward grace meet and mate and generate the most lasting of the Catholic's religious experiences."[8]

The Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence is very definite. The Holy Eucharist contains truly, really, and substantially the body and blood of Jesus Christ, together with His soul and divinity. The Church has explicitly condemned the various doctrines of the Reformers, who admitted only a symbolic or figurative or dynamic presence of Our Lord.[9] Surely, the Catholic meaning of the Real Presence, the very heart and soul of the liturgical and devotional life of the faithful, should be adequately explained in an essay intended to indicate the "spiritual core" of Catholicism —to borrow a phrase from the publishers of *The Great Religions of the Modern World*. Yet, this is the explanation actually given:

> The Catholic is above all grateful for that sacramental and, therefore, real Presence which is the occasion of his most fervent prayers and warmest conoslations, the center of his supreme act of communal worship in the Sacrifice of the Mass, the main source of his growth in holiness.[10]

Later the author tells us that the Council of Trent dealt with "the reality of the Presence in the Eucharist."[11]

Now, I challenge any intelligent person, unfamiliar with Catholic doctrine, who reads these words, to derive from them anything approaching an exact understanding of what Catholics mean by the doctrine of the Real Presence. Not a word is said to indicate who or what is present; the capitalized "Presence" is our only clew. It could signify the presence of the Godhead only, or it could indicate the presence of Christ by consubstantiation, impanation or merely by power. Indeed, one of the author's

[7] *DB*, 849-51.

[8] *The Great Religions of the Modern World*, p. 313.

[9] *DB*, 883.

[10] *The Great Religions of the Modern World*, p. 313.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 330.

quotations from Harnack would seem to favor the doctrine of consubstantiation—the statement that in the early Church "to talk of bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ was quite intelligible."[12] It would have been more profitable had the author devoted the page and a half given to quotations from Harnack to a clear explanation of the distinctively Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation—but this word is not mentioned in the essay.

The conditions of membership in the Catholic Church are said to be "to repent and to believe."[13] Nothing is said of the necessity of Baptism, although the Church has officially declared that this sacrament is the "gate of the Church" and that by it we are made "members of the body of the Church."[14] Neither is there any effort to expound the necessity of the Church as a means of salvation, except perhaps by remote allusion in the statement that in the Catholic Church alone Christ's "Way and Truth and Life can still be fully found."[15] Certainly the average non-Catholic reader of such an essay as this purports to be is desirous of an explanation of the much discussed dictum: "Outside the Church there is no salvation." Yet, this important question is entirely ignored.

The Catholic Church vigorously rejects the notion of a "religious sense" as the basis of belief in divine revelation. In the Oath against Modernism, still used by the Church, the Catholic states: "I most certainly hold and sincerely profess that faith is not a blind sense of religion, springing up from the depths of the subconsciousness under the pressure of the heart and the inflexion of the will morally informed, but a genuine assent of the intellect to truth extrinsically received by hearing. . . ."[16] Now, it would be unjust to assert that the following statements directly contradict these words, but it cannot be denied that they bear some resemblance to the idea of a "religious sense":

> Jesus once said, "The kingdom of God is within" (Luke 17:21). Looked at simply as a personal, religious experience, Roman Catholicism is the consciousness of membership in a society that, for a Catholic, integrates in a single living whole all the aspects of the "kingdom of God". . . . The Catholic is conscious, first, of what seems to him a

---

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 325.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 312.
[14] *DB*, 696, 895.
[15] *The Great Religions of the Modern World*, p. 316.
[16] *DB*, 2145.

communication of Divine power, an "inspiration," in virtue of which he feels able, "with God," to repent". . . . The Catholic is conscious, secondly, of what seems to him a communication of Divine light, an "illumination," in virtue of which he finds himself able, beyond the power of "flesh and blood," of natural insight, to "believe," to answer a challenge to his intelligence, to assent, however difficult the comprehension, to an objective body of truth, a religious creed, that appears to him to be a Divine Revelation. . . . The Catholic is conscious, especially after confession and Holy Communion, of a voice that speaks to him, as Jesus spoke to the Twelve . . .[17]

The author tells us that in his Encyclical *Immortale Dei* Pope Leo XIII, discussing the relation between Church and State, insisted that "each authority in its kind is supreme. Each has fixed limits within which it is contained. . . ."[18] But certainly, to give the full doctrine of the Pope, he should have added that the Holy Father in the same Encyclical laid down as the ideal some form of union between the two: "There must, accordingly, exist between these two powers a certain orderly connexion, which may be compared to the union of soul and body in man."[19] Similarly, although a number of inspiring quotations from the *Mystici corporis* are given, it would seem that in honesty to non-Catholic readers the words of Pope Pius XII, addressed directly to those not of the faith, should be quoted:

From a heart overflowing with love We ask each and every one of them to be quick and ready to follow the interior movements of grace, and to look to withdrawing from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. For even though unsuspectingly they are related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in desire and resolution, they still remain deprived of so many precious gifts and helps from heaven, which one can only enjoy in the Catholic Church.[20]

The author is anxious to point out that there have been bad Catholics, for he tells us:

Dante's *Inferno* is a sublime confession of the Catholic's shame in the presence of a long history of all too frequent lust and pride. . . .

---

[17] *The Great Religions of the Modern World*, pp. 311 ff.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 319.

[19] Cf. *Social Wellsprings*, I (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1943), 72.

[20] Encyclical *Mystici corporis*, Tr. Paulist Press, p. 35.

[21] *The Great Religions of the Modern World*, pp. 314, 334.

> Medieval Christianity was the creation of the Catholic Church. Like every other age, it had its tragically human side. The history of the Inquisition tells of ghastly episodes of ruthless cruelty.[21]

He also devoted two pages toward describing the willingness of Catholic leaders to have the co-operation of non-Catholics in promoting peace and good will. Now, all this is quite true, yet one wonders why such emphasis is given and so much space devoted to these matters, while there is not a single word about such fundamental Catholic doctrines as eternal punishment, purgatory, indulgences, the power to forgive sins, and the Church's appeal to miracles of the present day to improve her claims.

It is neither a pleasant nor an easy task to present in detail so unfavorable a comment on the work of a brother priest. But, as was said above, the issue is wider and more important than the merits or demerits of one particular essay. It involves the mode of procedure that should be adopted by any priest who is called on to explain the beliefs of the Catholic Church to those who are not of the fold. It stands to reason that courtesy and kindness are to be manifested. There is no place for scorn and sarcasm or for bitter personal attacks on non-Catholics, for such a procedure is opposed to Christian charity as the Catholic Church understands it. Furthermore, when we are called on to explain merely one doctrine of the Church or one phase of her worship or practice, we need not go out of our way to introduce controversial topics. But when we are expected to give a general exposition of Catholic teaching, we should give a straightforward and complete explanation, even though it may arouse a measure of antagonism or misunderstanding.

Some may argue that we should strive to win the good will of non-Catholics by first manifesting to them these aspects of Catholicism which will appeal to persons of good will, and only then explaining matters which will offer greater difficulty, when they are better disposed. I would not object to such a method when there is question of gradual instruction, as in the case of a series of lectures on the faith. But when a complete exposition of Catholic belief is called for, the winning of good will cannot justify the suppressing or passing over of "hard sayings." When Christ saw many of His followers depart because He had demanded their intellectual submission to a profound mystery, He remained uncompromising, and even more explicitly repeated

that He would give His very flesh and blood for the nourishment of those who would accept Him. Why should we adopt a different course when we are striving to fulfill His command to preach the Gospel to all mankind?

As to the results of such a procedure we can assert—relying on what has happened in the past—that many will thereby be led to enter a Church that is so logical and that has the courage to defy all human considerations in its efforts to guide souls to the truth. Others will hate the Church because of her uncompromising stand and will vent their anger by reviling and persecuting Catholics. But why should we be fearful of such a turn of events? If the Catholic Church ever arrived at a state where the world was tolerant and unkindly toward her, it would be a sign that her members were not faithful to the principles of her Divine Founder; for He prophesied that His loyal followers would be despised and maligned and mistreated in all ages. We must, indeed, pray for those who attack us and we must wish them well; but it would be a false charity to give them the impression that we can dilute Catholicism, or to present its teachings only partially in an effort to win their favor. For we adhere inflexibly to the principle that the Son of God established one Church as the necessary way of salvation for all men, and that Church is the Catholic Church.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

OUR LORD AS *COMPREHENSOR*

Jesus saw always with His human intelligence even here in this world, without having to interrupt His conversation with the apostles, the divine essence which St. Paul probably saw for a brief moment while he was in ecstasy. Our Lord was above ecstasy, and His word was so enlightening only because His intelligence was always brightened by that spiritual Sun which never sets. It was so illumined even while He slept, even during the agonized hour of the Passion.

—Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, in *Le Sauveur et son amour pour nous* (Juvisy, France: Éditions du Cerf, 1933), p. 197.

THE ORDEAL OF FATHER WALL

PART I

(*N. B. The case itself, and the characters named and portrayed are entirely fictional, being used to illustrate correct and incorrect ecclesiastical administrative procedure.*)

The warmth of the Florida sun on his now well-tanned limbs was just comfortable enough for Fr. Wall to doze off as he lay on the beach after his dip and watched the ocean heaving restlessly against the lighter blue of the far horizon. Peace, only faintly disturbed by the shouts of a few energetic bathers at their play down the beach, settled around the dozing pastor. He hated to think that in another few days he would have to make his way back North into the cold that the papers were reporting in his section of the country.

It was good to get away for a real vacation. A few days out of a week at intervals during the year were not enough to keep a man in the proper frame of mind. You really had to get away, far away, from it all, and stay away for a month or more in order to get a better perspective on things. Maybe that was why he had not handled himself so well in that last talk with the Bishop.[1]

The Bishop—coming around and finding the church dirty! Why hadn't that dumb curate in the neighboring parish called to let him know that the Bishop was in the vicinity so that he could have had everything in order just in case he should drop in. Of course, to be fair to the lad, he hadn't been out of the seminary very long, but you'd think they'd teach them those things in the seminary, or that the man would at least have brains enough to realize that his neighbors might be interested in the fact that the Bishop was in that part of the diocese.

Maybe he should have taken better care of the church and the sacristy.[2] It really had looked bad, when he came to think of it.

[1] Cf. Can. 2182.

[2] Cf. Can. 1178. Cf. also Benedict XIV, ep. encycl. *Annus qui*, Feb. 19, 1749 (*Fontes*, n. 395). A liberal translation follows: " But, to come to the point, what first of all We commend to you is this, that the churches be in the best of condition, spotless, clean, furnished properly; for anyone can readily understand that if strangers traveling through Our ecclesiastical territory see the churches of Our cities and dioceses falling to pieces, dirty and squalid, lacking in sacred vestments, or with those they have torn, dirty and in such condition

There shouldn't have been all those pine needles around the place. You'd think the women of the Altar Society would have noticed that without having to have the pastor tell them. After all, what were they in the Altar Society for if it was not to take good care of the church and not let things like that happen. You really couldn't expect a busy pastor to think of everything. He had had enough to do in the house without being in the church all the time to see that those women did their work. Maybe he had noticed the condition of the sanctuary when he said Mass, but after all, other things had come up and you just could not remember everything.

As a matter of fact, he had intended to notify the president of the Society over a week before that to change the altar cloth on which the flower vase had been spilled, but that, too, had slipped his mind, and then the Bishop had dropped in.

Maybe the candlesticks should have been taken care of sooner. When you came to think of it, they were rather shabby, but, then, it had been difficult during the war to get things done and he had grown so used to seeing them that way that he had not really

---

as to merit to be banned, certainly they will return to their countries offended at our ways and indignant over them. Here, however, We wish to note that We are not speaking of expensiveness, and of magnificence of our temples, nor of rich and costly furnishings; for We are not unaware that these cannot everywhere be had; but We do desire propriety and cleanliness, in which none can be lacking for it can very well go along and fit in with poverty. Among the other evils, with which the Church of God is afflicted, of this, too, laments Cardinal Bellarmine, saying, 'I pass over the fact that in certain places the sacred vessels, and vestments, with which the mysteries are celebrated, are found to be vile and sordid, entirely unworthy to be used for the tremendous mysteries. Perchance, however, those who use them are poor. That may be, but if they cannot be rich, they should at least see that they are clean and spotless.' Therefore Our Predecessor of recent memory, Benedict XIII, whose labors both for the preservation and for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and for promoting the proper appearance of the churches are very well known, used to propose as an example the churches of the Capuchin Fathers in which there is the greatest poverty, but in which an equally great cleanliness is apparent to all. Drexelius in tom. 17 of his works, printed at Munich, in the tract entitled *Gazophylacium Christi*, part. 2, cap. 2, pag. 153, writes thus, 'First, and foremost, what is due the temples is cleanliness. Not only should there be on hand the things which are necessary for sacred uses, but also, so far as possible, they should be most clean.' Properly and rightly he also inveighs against those who have houses which are well-adorned and cared for, but leave the churches in squalor and dirt. 'There are those, too, who have houses excellently built and well-adorned; in their temples and sacristies all is

noticed how bad they had become. The vestments would have looked better, he supposed, if they had been cleaned. The chalices and ostensorium could have stood some regilding, too, but during the war he had simply let it go, and then the Bishop had dropped in and found things in rather poor condition.

There was one bright side to the picture, however; it had given him a good excuse at last to fire that janitor who had caused him so much trouble two years ago. The Bishop had blocked him on firing the man at the time, but there would not be much that he could say now, after he had seen how the church was kept up. That was right, if the janitor had done the job he was being paid to do everything would have been all right and the Bishop would have had no occasion to warn Fr. Wall about the condition into which the church had been allowed to come. Well, in a way it served him right, taking the janitor's part when the pastor obviously knew better what kind of a worker he was, only to find that when he did get more pay he didn't do the work he

---

squalid; the altars stripped of their front coverings are barely covered on top with torn and dirty linens; in all the rest confusion, and squalor.' The great Doctor of the Church, Jerome, in the Letter to Demetrias showed clearly that he cared little whether churches were rich or poor. 'Others build churches, cover the walls with sheaths of marble, bring in huge columns, gild their capitals, which do not feel the precious ornament, doors they decorate with ivory and silver, and with gems the golden altars; I do not reprove them, I do not disapprove of it, let each abound in his own sense, it is better to do this than to sleep upon heaped up wealth.' He declared clearly, however, that he made very much of cleanliness of the churches when he extolled Nepotian with the highest praise, because he was diligent and solicitous in caring for the spotlessness and cleanliness of the churches and the altars, as can be seen in the Epitaph of that same Nepotian, which the Saint sent to Heliodorus. He says, 'He was, therefore, solicitous whether the altar was spotless, the walls without soot, the floors swept, the janitor frequently at the door, veils always at the openings, the sacristy clean, the vessels shining, and in all ceremonies a pious care displayed; no less, and no more did he neglect his duty.' Certainly it is carefully to be avoided, lest that happen, not without the greatest disgrace of the ecclesiastical order, which the aforesaid Cardinal Bellarmine tells of as having happened to him. He says, 'I, when once on a trip I was the guest of a noble and extremely rich Bishop, saw a banquet hall splendid with silver vessels, and a table loaded with every kind of excellent foods; the linens too, and everything else were spotless and sweetly perfumed. When, however, on the following day, early in the morning I went down to the church contiguous to the palace, that I might say Mass, I found everything the contrary, i.e. vile, sordid, so that I hardly dared celebrate the Divine mysteries in such a place and with such furnishings.' "

should. Maybe the ladies of the Altar Society were supposed to sweep and change the altar linens, but after all it was primarily the responsibility of the janitor and he had failed, so Fr. Wall was justified in firing him.

Wall sighed and streched lazily as a playful breeze tickled the few hairs which struggled to cover his pate. This was the life, no worrying about telephones and door-bells, no rushing over to the school to see how things were going there. Those men who had parishes without schools were the lucky ones. They did not have to get over to the school at a definite time on certain days of the week to see how the children were coming with their catechism. Of course, they had to teach the children for First Communion and Confirmation, but that did not happen too often, and then they could usually get some Sisters to do the job for them.

That was one place where the Bishop had been wrong, saying that he did not think Fr. Wall gave enough attention to the instructions for the children.[3] After all, the Sisters were doing a good job of it, and there was no sense in his having to go into their classes and take over. He went over and checked up from time to time, and that should be enough.

That other idea about explaining the catechism to the adults,[4] that was just a pipe-dream. How could you expect the older folks to come for catechism instructions? It was hard enough to get the children for it, unless you had them right in school where they had to take it. Besides, what time did he, Fr. Wall, have for that sort of instructions when he had converts to think of? Now there were people who needed to have the catechism explained to them, those who did not know anything about it. They needed it a lot more than those who had had it in school. Maybe these latter had forgotten a lot of what they had learned, but they could read, and if they didn't have enough interest and intelligence to read up on their Faith, why should he worry about it? After all, it was their souls, and they had to do something, too, to save them.

It was all that a man could do to give a sermon on Sunday. Maybe he wasn't as good as the men on The Catholic Hour, but then, what of it? They didn't expect to hear a Sheen, a Reilly, or a Benard when they came to Fr. Wall's church. It they wanted to hear those fellows they could listen to them on the radio. As a

[3] Cf. Can. 1330-1331.

[4] Cf. Can. 1332.

matter of fact, when those fellows did such a good job and got a lot of people, even non-Catholics, to listen to them it seemed rather a waste of time for a fellow like himself to try to spend a lot of time on a sermon. Cut it short, that was the way to do, and get them out quick. They liked to get Sunday Mass over in a hurry anyway.

The sand was soft and fine under his shoulder-blades and its warmth was welcome as Fr. Wall lay there day-dreaming, with the disturbing thoughts of the previous few minutes as far from his mind as the puffs of cloud which drifted lazily over head, high up in the blue.

Preaching, how he hated to think of going back to it. There had been a time, of course, when like every young seminarian, he had had his dreams of holding a congregation spell-bound by the power of his oratory; but a man soon outgrew that when he got out into the ministry and found that the congregation was bored instead of interested in those same "fifty-two Gospels" year after year. What could you say, really? He had as fine a collection of sermon books as any man in the diocese, and yet none of them yielded anything which was good for holding the attention of the people.

He didn't think his people were any different from the rest. He had been in other parishes, and had preached on occasion at still other places when he had been accepting invitations for that sort of thing. The response had always been the same. People just weren't interested in hearing a good sermon. All they wanted was to get to Mass and get it over with. That must be the reason, for, after all, he guessed he knew as much about gestures and voice inflection as the next one. Oh, maybe he wasn't quite as clever at it as some others, but did the people really care to hear them? You couldn't say material wasn't good, either; after all, the books he had to work from were acclaimed by all as the very best there were.

The old boys, the men who had been pastors when he was first a young curate had somehow known how to hold the congregation for an hour or more, and the people had seemed to like it; but then, they did not have so much to do in those days. There wasn't the ball game or the football game to listen to in the afternoon. There weren't the programs that everyone seemed to want to hear in the evenings. There weren't the movies to go to.

There just wasn't so much competition for the attention of your listeners years ago.

People were more interested in the problems of life in those days, too. They really thought about things and they appreciated having some one tell them what he thought about them. Nowadays nobody had time to think of saving his soul. It was a continual scramble to get ahead in the world, to make a lot of money, to keep up with the neighbors. How could you contend with ideas and feelings like that?

Maybe there were some people who were interested in the kind of life they ought to lead, at least some of the converts seemed to be; but even they, after they were received into the Church got to be like the others and didn't care too much one way or another. What the world needed was a reawakening to spiritual values. What a St. Paul could do with them!

Fr. Wall dozed off again in the caressing rays of the southern sun, without thinking whether St. Paul ever owned a sermon-book. The bathers down the beach became more excited in their game and their shouts grew louder, but nothing disturbed the peaceful snores which came from the relaxed figure on the sand.

* * * * *

The wind was bitter cold as it whistled down the main street of Jordan. The few who had to be out had their hats pulled down tightly on their heads and their faces buried deep behind the collars of their great-coats as they fought their way along leaning into the wild blasts. It was thus that Frank Faber bumped into Matt Connelly, the oldest of the committeemen.

"Hello, Frank, what have you been doing with yourself lately? We've missed you."

"Oh, working at odd jobs here and there, wherever I could get them."

"How did you happen to quit working as janitor at the church? We all thought you were getting along pretty well with the increased salary. Surely you can't make as much at odd jobs as you did up there."

"I didn't quit. I was fired."

"Fired? But why? You were doing a good job. We all thought so, the committeemen, I mean."

"Oh, the Bishop came unexpectedly one day and things were

not in apple-pie order, so Fr. Wall fired me. I had been so busy in the school getting things ready for that play they were having at Christmas and then cleaning up afterwards that I did not have much time to take care of the church. The Bishop didn't like the way it looked and told Fr. Wall about it. He called me in, after the Bishop had gone, and bawled me out, and then told me I was fired. There wasn't much I could do about it."

"But that's unfair!" exclaimed the committeeman. Both men were shivering by that time, so they quickly said good-bye and hurried off, each to his own destination.

The thought of what had happened to Frank Faber, however, rankled in Matt Connelly's mind. When he got home he told his wife about it. She, too, agreed that it did not seem right that Faber should have been removed from his position. He had been such a faithful worker and had always done such a good job in taking care of the church, that you'd think a little slip like that could be over-looked. Besides, he had certainly had a lot to do in taking care of the school, what with that Christmas play and all, and then the cleaning up afterward. He always made it a point to keep the school looking so nice, too. What if there had been something he had not done in the church, you'd think the women in the Altar Society could have done some work around the place to help the poor man out when he was so busy.

By the middle of the afternoon, Mrs. Connelly's views were shared by several other women in the parish. They thought the president of the Altar Society should have gotten her ladies to help Faber out. If he had not been able to take as much care of the church as he usually did it was certainly not his fault and you'd think that Fr. Wall would have realized it. They guessed that he just didn't like Faber after the janitor had won that law-suit in the Bishop's court. It was a dirty trick, however, to take such an excuse to get rid of the man, they all agreed. And what would poor Mrs. Faber do now, she was such a lovely person, too. Somebody ought to take the matter up with Father, but you couldn't do anything about it now, what with him off in Florida having himself a good time, and Frank Faber wandering around in the cold looking for odd jobs. It certainly was a shame.

Of course, anyone who would fail to come to a dying person wasn't much of a pastor, anyway.[5] They remembered how he had

[5] Cf. Can. 468, §1.

delayed in coming when he was called to the house of poor old Mrs. Adams and her such a good, pious woman, too. By the time he had reached there she had passed on, poor soul. Of course, everybody knew she had gone straight to heaven, if she hadn't who could hope to, but it did seem a shame he had not come when he was called. Of course, there was probably some good reason why he had not been able to get there, but after all, you did expect that the pastor would come when he was called. They wondered if the Bishop knew about that.

If Frank Faber was neglectful of his duties in not keeping the church clean, wouldn't you say that Fr. Wall was neglectful in not taking care of the dying in the parish? If Faber deserved to be fired, wasn't it just as good treatment for Fr. Wall? Of course, they would not presume to tell the Bishop his business, and he probably knew what he was doing in keeping Fr. Wall in Jordan, but maybe a younger man would be more careful about taking care of the sick.

Maybe a younger man would be a better preacher, too. It got tiresome hearing the same things over and over on Sundays. The missionaries who came from time to time, like for Forty Hours, seemed to have something to say. It wasn't the same old thing all the time. They wondered whether maybe the Bishop would move Fr. Wall and send them a younger man, when he heard about what Wall had done to Faber. They wondered, too, whether the Bishop had heard about it. Maybe someone ought to tell him. In a nice way, of course, because, poor man, he had so much on his mind; but, still, he might like to know what was going on, if he didn't already know. Of course, it must be he did not know, or he would surely have done something about it, for he seemed like such a nice man. He really must take an interest in things, for after all, if he took the trouble to go out of his way to drop in and see how the church was looking, didn't that just go to show that he wanted things to be right in the diocese? If he took that much interest in buildings he must take just as much interest in the people.

Was Fr. Wall really out of town that day when Mrs. Adams died? No one on the telephones seemed to know, but they thought it was possible. After all, he did go away for two and three days at a time ever so often, and then they had to call for the priest from the neighboring parish if they needed someone. The other

priest, they understood, was a good friend of Fr. Wall's and came quite willingly, and they guessed that Fr. Wall paid him back by looking after his place when he was away; but, of course, it was easier for Fr. Wall because the other man did not have a school and so it was not necessary to be on hand to give the Sisters Communion.

These poor Sisters had it hard. They had to teach all the regular school subjects and Religion, too. Maybe it was just as well, though, for when Fr. Wall came in for Religion class the children did not get as much out of it as when the Sisters taught them, especially Sr. Regina Marie. She was the best of them all, the ladies agreed. She knew more about teaching Religion than any of the others, including Fr. Wall. She made it interesting and not dry as dust, the way he did. Of course, he probably knew more about it, after all, look how priests have to study; but she was certainly better when it came to teaching the children. If it weren't for the Sisters what would Fr. Wall do about getting the children ready for First Communion and Confirmation?

Why, even the converts he had instructed came to the Sisters for the instructions in preparation for Confirmation. They thought Fr. Wall was good in his instructions to them before he received them into the Church. May be he just wasn't as interested in children, but you'd think he would take care of his own first, wouldn't you?

*****

The full southern moon might not have looked so beautiful to Fr. Wall as he watched it rise during his stroll after dinner, had he known how the wires were buzzing back in Jordan. The evening was warm, however, and he strolled along contentedly puffing on his cigar. Too bad this would have to end in another week and he would have to worry once more about bucking snow-drifts back home. It wouldn't be too long, however, before spring would arrive even there and the snow would be gone. There was a time when he had liked the winter with its brisk air and the squeaking of the snow under foot on cold mornings.

In those days he had not minded driving in an open cutter along the snow-filled roads listening to the jingling of the bells on the steaming horse. Nowadays he even hated to drive on the well-scraped roads in a heated car. He must be getting old, he reflected, not to enjoy the winter-time any more. Of course, when

you came to think of it, he was getting old. There were less and less names above his in the list of priests of the diocese. He had been in the top quarter of the list for some time now, and most of the youngsters in the lower half were hardly known to him any more. They were good men, no doubt, but they just didn't have the stuff the old-timers had had. Life was too soft for them now. It wasn't like the days when he had first gone out on the mission. In those days you had to be a man to take it. He squared his shoulders unconsciously at this thought.

There wasn't much opposition nowadays to keep a man on his toes. You didn't have to worry any more about publications and speakers who made a man sit up nights to prepare an answer, so the people would know what was going on, and how to defend their Faith. Now everybody just took it easy and there was no fighting any more. Maybe it was just as well, because to Fr. Wall it did not look as if these young fellows who were coming out would be very good in a rough-and-tumble argument such as you used to have in the old days before the world went soft. Then men had ideas and stood up for them and argued about them, instead of just sitting back and saying that everybody was right and why worry about things.

Those were the days when a man felt like preparing a sermon, and really got some fire into it when he delivered it. The people, too, were interested and paid attention to what you said. They would come up to you on the street afterwards and comment on what a good sermon it was, and how they liked the ideas which you had given them. It wasn't like that now, when they just seemed to sit there and wait for you to get on with the Mass. Maybe he'd feel like preaching a real old-time sermon again, if there were a real problem to talk about.

Some of the young fellows wanted to talk about Labor and Capital, but what did they know about it, and besides what had that got to do with the Gospel? It was the Gospel that they should preach about. Some of them, too, wanted to talk about Medicine, but you had to be careful about things like that, because there were bound to be doctors in the audience who probably knew more about such things than the man in the pulpit. Of course, you could always talk about Marriage, but the people got tired of that, too. They ought to know pretty well, anyway, what their duties were, if they were good Catholics. All they had to do was

put into practice what they had learned in Religion in school. That gave them all the answers they needed, so there was really nothing to discuss nowadays.

But, why bother about those things when there was such a pleasant evening to be enjoyed, and he wouldn't have too many more of them!

(To be continued)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for Jan., 1898, the leading article, one of a series on "American Foundations of Religious Orders," narrates the establishment and the early years of the Congregation of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament for Indians and Colored People by Mother Katherine Drexel, in 1891. In 1898 the Congregation numbered 48 professed sisters. [The venerable Foundress is still living in the mother-house at Cornwells Heights, Pa., and her Congregation now numbers 440 professed members]. . . . Fr. H. I. D. Ryder of England, presents a lengthy criticism of a work on St. Cyprian, by the retired Anglican Archbishop Benson, of Canterbury. Fr. Ryder praises the genuine scholarship of the work, while objecting to certain opinions upheld by the author, such as his interpretation of the phrase "Ecclesia principalis" applied by Cyprian to the Roman Church. . . . Fr. P. de Roo, of Centerville, Oregon, expounds the theory that ancient traditions existing among the American Indians bear a likeness to the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation and lead one to believe that at some remote period the light of Christianity reached these aboriginal tribes. . . . In the *Analecta* appears a decree of the Congregation of the Propaganda which reminds us that very few Catholic priests of the Oriental rites were in the United States fifty years ago. The decree permits Orientals who visit North America to conform temporarily to the Latin rite, with the obligation of resuming their own rite when they return home. But it adds that no Oriental who establishes a permanent abode in North America may pass over to the Latin rite, save with the express permission of the Holy See. The decree also recommends that the Archbishop of each province of North America attempt to provide the Ruthenian Catholics with a celibate priest of their own rite, or, if that is impossibe, with a priest of the Latin rite for their special needs.

F. J. C.

SACRED ART-MUSIC OF THE RENAISSANCE

The initial impetus given by the *Motu proprio* of Pius X to the unqualified reinstatement of Gregorian Chant as the music par excellence of the Church has, particularly during the past ten years, at last had notable consequences in our country. The barrier of "unbelief" has been broken down in many quarters by the slowly but steadily mounting conviction that the most appropriate form of sung prayer which has arisen from the soul of Christianity is, after all, the ancient plainsong of the Church. Pius X, however, did not see in chant the only acceptable form of church music. Modern music, provided it preserved intact the same glowing spirit as the chant, was also considered worthy of liturgic use. More than this, sixteenth-century polyphony, brought to perfection by Palestrina and his contemporaries, was "found worthy of a place side by side with Gregorian Chant, in the more solemn functions of the Church . . ."

Contemporary musicologists have seen in the sacred art-music of the Renaissance one of the most noble and sublime inventions which the creative genius of man has conceived and executed. Indeed, the Church has in this music a heritage of choral excellence unsurpassed in the history of the race, and equaled, perhaps, by only a handful of productions of the past three centuries. It is this heritage which secular universities are widely drawing upon, both in their choral work and in their courses of study. It is a heritage of which many Catholics are practically unaware.

Until the past generation the ordinary cultural history of the Renaissance had little to say about the role of art-music during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This must strike one as rather strange, since many of the important libraries of Europe, especially of Italy, are stocked with innumerable manuscripts, all dating from the period of the Renaissance itself. It is hard to see how the progress of the other arts could have been investigated so thoroughly, while music was almost entirely overlooked. But history seems inevitably to catch up with itself; and in regard to the history of Renaissance music, it has very nearly done so.

It has become a common observation (as Dr. Paul H. Lang says) that "the further the Renaissance and its culture have been explored, the further back have its beginnings been rele-

gated." This is pre-eminently true of the music of the period. For a long time the opinion was held that the spirit of the Renaissance did not penetrate musical art until close to the year 1600, when the timid beginnings of opera appeared in Florence. Modern research, however, has shown that this conclusion was drawn from false premises, and scholars have pushed back generation by generation the origins of Renaissance music until at present the year 1500 seems much nearer the point at which it first found unmistakable expression.

The spontaneous outburst of new song that rose from the soul of this humanistic age was not, we know today, spontaneous in the sense that it was altogether unprepared or unexpected. The roots from which this new song took its flower had been planted almost a century before in the northern regions of Burgundy and Flanders. Here, while Jan van Eyck and Rogier van der Weyden were distinguishing themselves as the leading Flemish painters, a group of Burgundian composers—Guillaume Dufay, Gilles Binchois, and their followers—were uniting in their works the best elements of three medieval musical traditions, Gothic, Italian, and English. They were spurred on in their efforts for originality by the impetus which the Englishman John Dunstable had given to music on the continent during the first quarter of the quattrocento. With the all too plausible sounds of present-day harmony ringing in our ears we would be inclined to consider the music of Dufay as very primitive indeed; but judged on its own merits, it reveals a melodic sense and a depth of religious emotion which is beyond us only because it is too subtle for us.

The generation which took up where Dufay and his followers left off made more definite advances towards a clear Renaissance style. Its two leading figures, Jan van Ockeghem, a Fleming, and Jacob Obrecht, a Netherlander, were geniuses of the first rank, but it is to Ockeghem that we especially owe the development of a contrapuntal technique which was to serve as the basis of composition for all the great musicians until the beginning of the seventeenth century. By exploring almost all the possibilities latent in free imitation, Ockeghem effected a marvelous equalizing of all the parts in a given composition. Both he and Obrecht—like Dufay before them—derived their finest inspiration from the liturgy of the Church, and it is in their sacred works that we find their most outstanding achievements.

Thus far the progress made in music by the men of Flanders was in itself valuable and praiseworthy, but taken in relation to what followed, we must regard it as preparatory. It was in Josquin Despres, native of Hainault and student of Ockeghem, that the spirit of Renaissance musical art finally found its incarnation. In the works of Josquin we have a music which is distinctively characterized by clarity and balance, euphony and expressiveness—in short by a fulgent humanism that is naturally associated with everything that we term "Renaissance." But Josquin's imprint on quattrocento and early cinquecento music was not one of quality only: he also reshaped almost single-handedly three of the great forms—the chanson, motet, and Mass—which (together with the madrigal) remained the most perfect choral media for composers of the century following.

The stage prepared by Josquin and his noted contemporaries, Heinrich Isaac, and Pierre de la Rue, was now ready to be peopled by the almost endless line of first-class composers who appeared in quick succession in sixteenth-century Flanders, England, Spain, France, Germany, and Italy. It would carry us too far afield to enter into details concerning the schools which arose in each of these countries. But it is worthy of note that though many of the representatives which these schools produced composed secular madrigals and chansons with facility, almost all without exception found their most complete expression in music inspired by and written for the liturgy of the Church. Nicolas Gombert, Philippe de Monte, and Orlandus Lassus carried on the finest traditions of the Flemish in their Masses and motets. Thomas Tallis and William Byrd spanned the century in England, composing unexcelled masterworks for a Church that was condemned and persecuted. Cristobal Morales and Tomas Luis de Victoria brought fame to the Spain of Charles V and Philip II. And in Italy, Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli, Giovanni Animuccia, and many others revealed a contrapuntal skill and a religious depth in music which has never ceased to be a source of admiration and praise.

Since the compositions of these masters are polyphonic, and of their very nature require a trained group of singers, the conclusion might be drawn by some that this music militates against corporate worship and that as such it differs very little from the lavish and superficial sacred music of the eighteenth and nine-

teenth centuries. Against this conclusion—or better, misapprehension—we have the positive injunction of Pius X that sixteenth-century music is to be restored. Somewhere there must be a point of reconciliation. Henry Coates, in his admirable volume on Palestrina, states it clearly, and to my mind, satisfactorily.

> [Polyphony] is, in fact, an appeal, through the ear, to remind the congregation of the significance and meaning of the liturgical act of worship. Palestrina's religious music is to be taken in the same spirit as the work of those medieval architects who built the great churches and the master-craftsmen who fashioned lovely ornaments for them, and it may be regarded, in this way, as merely a receptacle for the sacred text upon which all the art of the musical craftsman has been lavished for its adornment. All is intended to aid corporate worship: thus the music was composed as part of the services, not *for* them. It is this impersonal quality, this aloofness from the human element which gives to such music its mystic atmosphere, its sense of remoteness, of something timeless and ageless, ideal qualities from the liturgical point of view (p. 83).

And elsewhere Mr. Coates mentions that this music "neither represents the composer's personal reactions to the emotional idea of the sacred texts nor provides a 'ready-made' emotion for the listener."

The *Motu proprio* does not demand that the congregation sing all the chant ordinary and proper all of the time; it admits that other music does exist which "bridges the gap" between the people and the liturgy. Actually, though it may not appear evident at first sight, there is an extraordinarily close affinity between chant and classical polyphony. The latter is really an outgrowth of the former, a fact which any trained listener will immediately grasp. Mr. Coates (in the work referred to above, p. 96) goes so far as to state: "It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the greater part of it owes its origin to this source [i.e. chant], and that without plainchant we should never have had the greatest of Palestrina's] music." What he says of the Italian master likewise holds true of the other great Renaissance composers. Pius X, who described in such clear terms the spirit of genuine church music, must have perceived this close affinity. He would not have given polyphony his whole-hearted approval had he not realized that essentially it was music which fostered the meaning of the sacred services, and aided the listener in

partaking in them; he knew, in other words, that polyphony could be *part* of the liturgy, and not merely a distraction from it. Perhaps he also saw in this music a bridge made-to-order, over which a twentieth-century Catholic could pass to an intelligent and abiding appreciation of ancient chant. For such reasons his *Motu proprio* recommended the restoration of golden age choral music. And for such reasons it is indeed worthy of being sung "in the more solemn functions of the Church."

FRANCIS J. GUENTNER, S.J.

St. Mary's College,
St. Mary's, Kansas

THE PROGRESS OF ASSIMILATION TO CHRIST

The members of the Mystical Body of Christ ought to share His life more and more, in order to become like to Him. The sacred Humanity of the Saviour progressively communicates to us the graces which it has merited for us upon the Cross. This is the *influx* of the Head of the Mystical Body upon the members of that Body. Through this *influx,* Our Lord wills that we should become more and more like unto Him, by baptism, by absolution, by frequent communion, by the crosses and purifications requisite for our advancement, up to the reception of Extreme Unction and of our entrance into heaven. In the lives of many Saints, we see this progressive assimilation by a certain reproduction in them of the mysteries of Our Lord's infancy, those of His hidden life, then those of His apostolic life, and finally of His life of sorrows.

—Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, in *L'amour de Dieu et la Croix de Jésus* (Juvisy, France: Éditions du Cerf, 1929), I, 256.

UT REVELENTUR EX MULTIS CORDIBUS COGITATIONES

The secret thoughts which Jesus Christ is going to reveal are principally those in which we deceive ourselves, when we believe that we are doing for God's sake what we are actually doing for our own interests, or out of envy of authority, or in favor of our own individual opinions. These are the thoughts that are most hidden, since we take care to hide them from our very selves.

—Bishop Jacques Benigne Bossuet, in his *Élévations sur les mystères,* cap. 20.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S USE OF THE NOTE OF CATHOLICITY

Long before St. Augustine began to teach and to defend the divinely revealed doctrine of Our Lord's true Church, the great mass of mankind, both members and non-members of the Church, had come to use the term *Catholic* as the distinctive designation of this society. The expression first appears in patristic literature during the opening decade of the second century. Employed somewhat sparingly at the outset it became the usual and ordinary title of Christ's true Church by the middle of the third century. Yet, despite the fact that there had been certain more or less rhetorical expositions of the Church's catholicity prior to his time, it remained for St. Augustine to formulate what was to be the definitive theological explanation of this characteristic of God's kingdom on earth.

The tendency of some modern theological writers to shy away from what may be called the geographical implications of the Church's catholicity find little support in the teachings of St. Augustine. Thus, to mention only a few examples, in his second book *Contra litteras Petiliani Donatistae Cirtensis Episcopi*, in the second book of his work *Contra Gaudentium Donatistarum Episcopum*, and in his *Ad Catholicos epistola contra Donatistas* (better known as the *De unitate ecclesiae*), the greatest of the Latin Fathers of the Church insists upon the derivation of the term "catholic" from the Greek *καθ' ὅλον*, and gives a definitely geographical explanation of that catholicity. St. Augustine insisted that the true *ecclesia*, the actual kingdom of God on earth, was a society commissioned by Our Lord Himself to establish itself throughout the world. Furthermore, he contended that, by virtue of the divine aid actually promised and given to this society, it had been founded in territories scattered over the face of the earth. Hence, he concluded, it could be distinguished readily from other societies falsely claiming the Christian name by the very fact that the accomplishment of the divine prophecies and the divine promises could thus be recognized in it.

By far the greater portion of St. Augustine's teaching about the catholicity of the Church was evolved and expressed in works directed against the errors of the African Donatists. Hence it is

quite impossible to appreciate his meaning unless we realize the common ground he was able to use in his attempts to bring into the glory of Christian unity those unfortunates who had been misled by the propaganda of Donatism. The holy Bishop Augustine, it must be understood, offered shining example of enthusiastic devotion to the "home missions" of his own time and of his own country. In order that men for whom Our Lord had sacrificed Himself on Calvary might not perish forever, St. Augustine devoted every ounce of his energy to the task of persuading the Donatists of his district to enter and to dwell within the true and only Church of Jesus Christ. Meekly accepting insult and calumny, he made use of every available opportunity to show the urgency of the divine command to come into the true Church as well as the horrible spiritual disadvantages attendant upon their present condition of heresy and schism. Furthermore, he utilized every intellectual resource at his disposition to bring out the evidence that the Church for which he labored is, and is alone, the Body of Jesus Christ.

St. Augustine was dealing, however, with a group of men manifestly capable of talking his own language on his own plane. They were men who said that they wanted to be, and actually claimed to be, followers or disciples of Jesus Christ Our Lord. They were perfectly aware of the fact that there is such a thing as the one true *ecclesia*. They realized that in order to be truly a disciple of Christ, a man had to belong to the society of the disciples, the true *ecclesia* which is actually God's kingdom in this world. Finally, like some of the heretics of our own time, they were willing to admit that this true *ecclesia* of Jesus Christ was properly designated as the *Catholic* Church. As a matter of fact they could hardly help making this admission. By the latter part of the fourth century the baptismal formula in use in most of the Churches professed belief in "the holy Catholic Church." Thus, if men were to make any serious claim to the Christian name and the Christian status, they had to identify themselves in one way or another as "Catholics," and to look for some way, however far-fetched in which their own company could be identified as "the Catholic Church."

The method adopted by the particular Donatist writers and debaters whose arguments were taken up by St. Augustine was, basically at least, identical with the procedure later followed by

the Protestant heretics. The Donatist claimed, first of all, that the true Church's title of "Catholic" bespoke and implied a fullness of truth within the Church and the possession of all the sacramental means of salvation within this society. They claimed the complete possession of Christian truth and the enjoyment of all the ecclesiastical sacraments for their own assembly, and denied that the *magna ecclesia* had any right to the title of "Catholic" on these grounds.

The Donatist camp paid comparatively little attention to the geographical concept of catholicity. They refused to concede that the Church of Christ could be called Catholic by reason of any extension throughout the nations and the localities of the earth. Yet, oddly enough, they disputed even the obvious evidence of the spatial or geographical universality of the Church of their opponents. Those whom the world called Catholic had, they said, no real claim to this glorious title even on the grounds of regional, national, or numerical extension, since these people were not in religious communion with all those who claimed the Christian name throughout the world, and because all the nations of the world had not yet received the gospel of Jesus Christ. Thus they managed to convince themselves that the society for which St. Augustine labored was only a partial thing, and consequently a Church which had no real claim to the title of the *ecclesia catholica.*

Thus, in working for the conversion of the Donatists, the saintly Bishop of Hippo Regius did not need to show the beneficiaries of his missionary charity and zeal that they were obligated to enter into the true *ecclesia* of Christ. Neither did he have to exert himself to show that this true *ecclesia* was actually the *ecclesia catholica* of the creed. Instead he conceived it to be his business to use every device of theological acumen within his power to bring these unfortunate dissidents to realize that the God-given catholicity of the true *ecclesia* was essentially a geographical thing and that the note of geographical or, as some of the modern writers would have it, "spatial," catholicity marked the communion within which he worked as the Church within which God commands all men to live.

St. Augustine's explanations and demonstrations of the Church's catholicity are always couched in the language of apostolic meekness and charity rather than in terms of merely

scholastic method. He was using all of the tremendous intellectual and persuasive forces with which God had endowed him to make men look at the truth to which their own passions and prejudices had blinded them. The Donatistic system, like a great many dissident doctrines since that day, was essentially an afterthought. The frenzied objections and claims of the Donatistic leaders were intended primarily to justify a position which the Donatists of a previous generation had taken for entirely different motives. The original Donatist faction had been composed of certain African malcontents supported in their opposition to Mensurius the Bishop of Carthage and Cecilian his successor by certain bishops from Numidia. The definitive schism came in 313, when an assembly of these rebels declared Cecilian invalidly elected and chose Majorinus in his place.

The original dissidents had justified their stand by the contention that Bishop Felix of Aptonga, the consecrator of Cecilian, had surrendered the sacred books to the pagans during the persecution of Diocletian, and that consequently he had no power to administer episcopal consecration. Despite the fact that the innocence of Felix was established and recognized by several investigating committees, the Donatists persisted in their stand, and anathematized the Catholics as men polluted by their contact with the *traditor* Felix. The Roman See, and with it all the rest of the Church of Jesus Christ on earth quickly entered into communion with Cecilian and his followers. Hence the Donatists found themselves impelled to explain their position by twisting and perverting the regularly taught doctrine about the *Catholica*.

A considerable portion of St. Augustine's campaign against the Donatist errors had to be devoted to the task of explaining that the moral worth of Cecilian and of Felix had nothing whatsoever to do with the question of the identity of the true Catholic Church. Nevertheless, the main body of his polemic was given over to the task of showing that the geographical extension of the Church to which he belonged was sufficient to designate that Church *to the Donatists* as the real kingdom of God on earth.

St. Augustine thus described the question at issue between the Catholics and the Donatists.

> The question at issue between us is certainly about where the *ecclesia* is; whether it is in our company or in theirs. This is surely the one

[Church] which our forefathers have called the *Catholica* in order that they might manifest it for what it is by its very name, because it is throughout the whole [world] *(per totum)*. For the Greek expression for "according to the whole (*secundum totum*)," is *καθ' ὅλον*. But this Church is the Body of Christ, as the Apostle says: "For his body which is the Church." Hence it is certainly manifest that the person who is not among the members of Christ cannot have Christian salvation. But the members of Christ are bound one to another through the charity of unity, and through this same charity they are joined to their Head, which is Christ Jesus. Therefore everything revealed about Christ concerns the Head and the Body. The Head is Jesus Christ Himself, the only-begotten Son of the living God, Himself the Saviour of the Body, who has died for our sins and who has risen from the dead for our justification. The Body is the Church, about which it is said: "That he might present it to himself, a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing." The question between us and the Donatists is about where this Body is, that is, where the Church is.[1]

St. Augustine's missionary and apostolic patience wore somewhat thin when he came into all-to-frequent contact with the obstinate refusal of the Donatist leaders to take cognizance of the manifest Catholicity of the society to which he belonged. So, when Petilianus asserted that the Catholics had "gone aside into the part," and had thus forfeited their right to the Catholic name, he made this reply.

I also have gained a very slight knowledge of the Greek tongue, hardly to be called knowledge at all. Yet I am not at all ashamed to say that I realize that *ὅλον* means, not "one," but "the whole"; and that *καθ' ὅλον* means "according to the whole." From this the Catholic Church received its name, according to the saying of the Lord: "It is not for you to know the times which the Father hath put in his own power: but you shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth." Know that the *Catholica* receives its name from this. But you are so intent on running with your eyes shut against the mountain which, according to the prophecy of Daniel, grew out of a small stone and filled the whole earth, that you actually tell us that we have gone aside into a part, and that we are not in the whole, among those whose communion is spread abroad over the entire earth. But, just as, if you were to say that I am Petilianus, I would not be able to find any way to refute you other than

[1] *De unitate ecclesiae*, cap. 2. *CSEL*, LII, 232.

to laugh at you as speaking in jest or to mourn for you as being mad, so now, I see that I have no choice other than this. Since I do not believe that you are joking, you see what alternative remains.[2]

The saintly Bishop of Hippo Regius also protested vehemently against the attempt on the part of Gaudentius the Donatist to use the testimony of St. Cyprian as an indication that his faction deserved the Catholic name. St. Augustine deplored the blindness that motivated men to speak against the manifest evidence of the Cyprianic writings.

Why, then, do you deceive yourselves and wish to deceive others by these impudent lies? If yours is the Catholic Church according to the testimony of this martyr, then show that it spreads its rays over the entire world: show that it extends is branches, in the abundance of its fruitfulness, over the whole earth. For the *Catholica* has received its name in the Greek tongue from this. For, what is called ὅλον in Greek is called *totum* or *universum* in Latin. "Through the whole" or "according to the whole" is καθ' ὅλον, from which the *Catholica* receives its name.[3]

As far as their positive teaching was concerned, the Donatists held that the Catholic name of the true Church of Jesus Christ referred to some universality of truth, of the sacraments, of the means of salvation, or of obedience to the divine commandments, rather than to any geographical matter. Thus the *Breviculus collationis* informs us that at the famous debate between the Catholics and the Donatists at Carthage, the Catholics asserted that they, and not their opponents, "were in communion with the Church spread over the entire world, which is the Church to which the scriptures bear witness, and that hence they were, and were rightly called, the Catholics." The Donatists, on the other hand, claimed that "the Catholic name owes its origin, not to any universality of nations, but rather to the fulness of the sacraments." And, when the Donatists petitioned "that the Catholics should prove that all nations were in communion with them," the Catholics announced that they would be very pleased to offer that proof.[4]

Although the geographical origin and meaning of the term

[2] *Contra litteras Petiliani*, II, 91. *CSEL*, LII, 75.

[3] *Contra Gaudentium*, II, 2. III, 3, *CSEL*, LIII, 53.

[4] *Breviculus collationis*, *CSEL*, XXXIV, 468.

"Catholic" were clear enough, St. Augustine refused to let what was essentially an apostolic quest for souls degenerate into a mere exercise in historical philology. The Catholic Church, after all, based its contentions, not on the development of a theological expression, but on the manifest predictions and promises of Jesus Christ Our Lord. St. Augustine brought out this aspect of his teaching in a letter to Vincentius, a bishop of the Rogatist party.

> You believe that you have made a very subtle statement when you assert that the name "Catholic" means universal, not with reference to the communion as embracing the entire world, but with reference to obedience to all the divine commandments and to all the sacraments. It is as if we (even granting that perhaps the *Catholica* may have derived its name from the fact that it truly holds the entirety of that truth of which some particles are found in different heresies), based our defence of the Church throughout all the nations upon the testimony of this word rather than upon the promises of God and the many and manifest declarations of the Truth itself.[5]

Those who would hold, then, that the Catholic name of the true Church was derived from the fact that this society has all the truth contained in public revelation, or all the sacraments, or that it obeys all the commandments, could expect no explicit opposition from St. Augustine against such contentions. To him it was clear enough that the Catholic name originated from and signified the geographical extension of Our Lord's society. Those who would quibble about the meaning of a word, without adverting to the normal use of that term among men, could be left to their own imaginings, as far as St. Augustine was concerned. He was interested in showing that his Church, the Church of the universal communion, was actually the Body of Christ, the Church of the promises. To accomplish this purpose he had recourse to the divine promises themselves. He brought out the evidence that the benefits which Our Lord had, according to the scriptures, promised to the society of His disciples, were to be found in the Church of the Catholic communion, and in that company alone. Thus, for St. Augustine, the fact of Catholicism rather than the mere name was to be considered as a note of Our Lord's society. Or, to speak the truth more completely, the Catholic name was

[5] *Ep. XCIII*, 23. *CSEL*, XXXIV, 468.

efficacious as a mark of the true Church only to the extent that it was recognized as the accomplishment of the divine promises made to God's kingdom on earth.

The central promise of Christ which St. Augustine saw as manifestly fulfilled in the visible Catholicity of the true Church was the one set down in the last chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke. Our Lord spoke thus to His disciples prior to His ascension into Heaven.

> And he said to them: Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise again from the dead, the third day:
>
> And that penance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, unto all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.[6]

With this text St. Augustine associated the parallel passage from the Acts of the Apostles, in which Our Lord told the disciples that "you shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you, and you shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth."[7] Thus, for St. Augustine, the true Church of Jesus Christ was manifestly that which "starting out from Jerusalem, was spread abroad over the whole world." The use of this formula is exemplified in a section of the *Breviculus collationis* which tells of certain letters written by the Donatists in response to a *mandatum* of the Catholics. The Donatists were unable to give a satisfactory answer

> first, because they did not wish to treat adequately or even to touch upon the evidences *(testimonia)* taken from the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms, and the Apostolic and Evangelical writings, [testimonies] by which it is shown that the Catholic Church is spread abroad through the entire world beginning from Jerusalem, whence, extending into lands both near and far away, it came finally to Africa. And there are throughout the other localities and cities, throughout which it was previously established, many Churches founded by apostolic labor and belonging to this *unica,* with which it is manifest that the Donatists are not in communion.[8]

In this same chapter there is mention of the evidences "which the Catholics brought forward in favor of the Church in which

[6] *Luke* 24: 46-47.

[7] *Acts* 1: 7-8.

[8] *Breviculus collationis*, cap. 10. III, 10. *CSEL*, LIII, 59.

they communicate, that which, beginning from Jerusalem, is spread throughout the world." The expression occurs dozens of times in the anti-Donatist writings and sermons of St. Augustine. Naturally enough, the Catholic theologians who were first called upon to fight against the errors of Protestantism appealed to the writings of St. Augustine. They employed his terminology as well as his conclusions. Particularly at the hands of the Louvain theologians, the "*ecclesia incipiens a Hierusalem*" became one of the favorite titles of the true Church of the promises.

Thus John Driedo employed this concept of the true Church frequently in his work *De ecclesiasticis scripturis et dogmatibus.*[9] Francis Sonnius incorporated St. Augustine's own words into his *Demonstrationes religionis christianae ex verbo Dei.*[10] Thomas Stapleton, the greatest of all the Louvain theologians, employed the expression both in his *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica*[11] and in the revision and digest of that work, the *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium relectio scholastica et compendiaria.*[12]

St. Augustine used the original promise made by God to Abraham to explain and to prove the true and geographical catholicity of Christ's kingdom on earth. Turning some of the raillery of the Donatists against their own cause, the great Bishop of Hippo Regius explained that membership in Christ involved membership in the world-wide organization.

> . . . I may say with perfect justice that he who has not delivered himself up to Christ in company with the whole world should be considered a partner of the man who betrayed Christ. The Apostle says that "then are you the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise." And again he says: "heirs indeed of God and joint heirs with Christ." And he shows that the same seed of Abraham belongs to all nations, according to the promise given to Abraham: "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."[13]

St. Augustine also used the words of Psalm 2 in showing that, according to the scriptures, the company or the kingdom of Jesus

[9] In the 1530 edition of Louvain, pp. 505, 510, 512.

[10] *Tract.* VIII, cap. 2; in the 1556 Louvain edition, p. 464.

[11] In the Paris edition of 1579, pp. 114, 143.

[12] In the Antwerp edition of 1596, pp. 125, 464.

[13] *Contra litteras Petiliani*, II, 20. *CSEL*, LII, 32.

Christ was predicted as a world-wide society. In this Psalm the Lord is represented as saying to the divine Messias: "Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession."[14]

St. Augustine interpreted the Scriptures (which, incidentally, he considered to be the sole source of an efficacious demonstration of the true Church against the Donatist errors),[15] as promising the kingdom of God on earth a moral rather than a physical catholicity. The Donatists were prone to disregard the true Church's claim of real and geographical catholicity on the grounds that the Catholics of Africa were not in ecclesiastical communion with all of the races of the earth, considered absolutely. Thus the Donatist Cresconius denied the Church's claim to catholicity on the pretext that there were at that time many barbarous nations which had not as yet been won for Christ, and with which, in consequence, the Catholics were not in communion. He furthermore alleged the somewhat silly reason that the Church could not properly be termed "Catholic" because it was manifestly not in communion with the various heretical conventicles scattered throughout the world.[16]

St. Augustine answered that particular observation with the statement that many of the nations which Cresconius mentioned as not having been evangelized had actually heard the message of Christ since the appearance of his writing. Here, in a passage freighted with meaning for the theology of the Catholic missions, St. Augustine assured his Donatist opponent that that Church continued to increase among the nations, and that, after it had been given to all of them, the end itself would come.[17] Thus, for the greatest of the Latin Fathers, the catholicity of the true Church of Jesus Christ was essentially a dynamic rather than a static thing. The Church was in existence throughout the world, and furthermore it was necessarily, in virtue of the divine commission and of the divine grace by which it operates, growing and increasing throughout the world, in the sense of bringing new peoples to the fellowship of Jesus Christ.

[14] *Psalm* 2: 8.

[15] Cf. *Ep. XCIII*, 28; *De unitate ecclesiae*, cap. 5. *CSEL*, XXXIV, 472f.; LII, 236.

[16] *Contra Cresconium*, III, 70. *CSEL*, LII, 476.

[17] *Ibid.*, III, 71. *CSEL*, LII, 476 f.

In the writing of St. Augustine the notion of a merely successive catholicity for the true Church is firmly rejected. The Donatists maintained that their own Church had a right to the Catholic name by reason of what they considered the backsliding of the rest of Christendom. The world-wide Church of Jesus Christ had fallen away from the truth by reason of its fellowship with Cecilian. The nations that thus perished (according to the Donatist scheme of things), were supposed to have had their chance for salvation. The assembly to which they belonged was thus, in their eyes, the faithful remnant of a company which, at one time or another had been in existence throughout the world, but which was, in their time, restricted to a portion of Africa and to a couple of scattered groups of Africans resident outside of their own country.[18]

In opposing this contention, St. Augustine pointed to the fact that the divine prophecies and promises indicate an actually catholic kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth. To attempt to restrict the true *ecclesia* of Jesus Christ to members of a dissident conventicle limited to a couple of Roman provinces would be, in any event, a try at limiting the salvific will of God Himself. The people of the other parts of the Empire, and those outside of the Roman dominions *a fortiori*, had hardly heard of the Donatists and their arguments at all. If their salvation depended upon union with such a society, then, indeed, they would be unfortunate.

St. Augustine was firmly convinced that the divine promises, through the visible accomplishment of which the *ecclesia* is manifestly a *Catholic* society, never meant to imply that absolutely all of the races of the earth will be evangelized until the end; nor that, in the nations evangelized, every member of these political or ethnical groups will become a member of the true Church.[19] On the other hand he believed that the Church will always be a visible organization, and that it will remain visibly catholic by reason of a great number of adherents scattered throughout the world. Answering the objection of Cresconius to the effect that the paucity of those saved, according to Our Lord's word, would seem to imply that the true Church could not be actually catholic, the Saint answered that the Church would

[18] Cf. *De unitate ecclesiae*, cap. 37. *CSEL*, LII, 279.

[19] *Ep. CXCIX*, 48. *CSEL*, LVII, 287.

always be large enough to be visible, and that it would always be small enough to be the subject of persecution on the part of its enemies.[20] There will always be a "mixed multitude" of these enemies of the true Church. Through the efforts of these foes, the piety of the Church can be at once exercised and manifested.

The catholicity of the Church was, in the teaching of St. Augustine, bound up closely with the communion of the apostolic Churches, and in particular with that of the apostolic Church of Rome. Catholicity was not by any means the only note or mark of the Church. In writing against the Manicheans St. Augustine drew up a list of the factors which kept him within the membership of the Church. The first of these factors is the wisdom of the Church, a wisdom which cannot be grasped by those outside its fold. There are, however, four other factors.

> . . . not to speak of this wisdom, which you do not believe to be in the Catholic Church, there are many other things which most justly keep me within its bosom. The consent of peoples and nations keeps me within the Church. So does its authority, begun by miracles, nourished in hope, enlarged by love, established in age. The succession of priests keeps me [in the Church], beginning from the very See of the Apostle Peter, to whom the Lord, after His resurrection, gave the commission to feed His sheep, down to the present episcopate. And so, finally, does the name "Catholic" itself.[21]

Despite the fact that the catholicity of the true Church of Jesus Christ is not by any means its only note, that catholicity is, in the hands of St. Augustine, a truly effective instrument for pointing out to a group which professes to accept the scripture as God's inspired word, that the Church which exists throughout the world is in reality the Body of Christ. He used this characteristic of the Church with success in demonstrating that the society which was in communion with the Roman See was, by the evidence of Our Lord's own promises, the one true Church, necessary for man's salvation.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[20] *Contra Cresconium*, III, 75. *CSEL*, LII, 480 f.

[21] *Contra epistolam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti*, cap. 4. *CSEL*, XXV, 196.

Answers to Questions

THE ALLELUIA ADDITIONS ON CORPUS CHRISTI

Question: Why, in the Divine Office for Corpus Christi and its Octave, do we have the *Alleluia* in the short responsories and the versicles and responses immediately following for Tierce, Sext, and None, but not in Prime or in Compline?

Answer: The *Alleluia* appears in the responsories of Tierce, Sext, and None, and in the versicles and responses immediately following, on the feast of Corpus Christi and throughout its Octave because the text in question is strictly proper to the feast of the Blessed Sacrament, while in Prime and Compline the responsories are common to all days of the year. Their Eucharistic character also accounts for the addition of the *Alleluia* to the versicles and responses at the end of the hymns of Lauds and Vespers on Corpus Christi. This is the only feast which employs, *extra tempus Paschale*, the supplementary Alleluias which are otherwise distinctive of the Easter season.

"BLESSED" AND "BLEST" AGAIN

A correspondent suggests that when an object is holy because of intrinsic holiness the proper word is bless-ed. Thus we speak of the Bless-ed Sacrament, the Bless-ed Virgin, never of the Blest Sacrament or the Blest Virgin. Objects which derive their holiness from without, from an intrinsic source, may be designated by the monosyllabic word, blest, as a blest Rosary or a blest candle.

THE MANDATUM ON HOLY THURSDAY

We are pleased to receive a letter from a reader, who is the pastor of a Franciscan parish in New Mexico, in favor of the *Mandatum* in parochial churches. He states that he grew up with the ceremony from the time he was an altar boy in the Cathedral parish in Los Angeles and that he has performed the rite every Holy Thursday of the forty years of his priesthood. He knows of no *admiratio populi* concerning the ceremony but

testifies to the yearly presence of a goodly congregation who expect the *Mandatum* as part of the Holy Week ceremonies. With him washing of the feet is performed for altar boys, selected for this ceremony, "their good mothers making sure that their sons have thoroughly washed their own feet" before the ritual washing in the church and each boy is presented with a specially decorated piece of cake, in lieu of the coin of which Martinucci and others speak.

In our reply to the question, "Should We Revive the *Mandatum?*" in the issue of AER for July, 1946, we did not wish to give the impression that we were opposed to its observance. *Tout au contraire.* We merely feared the negative reaction of most pastors to its introduction and recomended the prudence of consultation with the bishop before including it on the calendar of Holy Week observances. We are glad to hear of the practice of our good correspondent and to learn that, in his experience, there has been no *admiratio populi* concerning the performance of the *Mandatum* in the ordinary parish church.

PRECEDENCE IN THE ORDER OF COMMON MASSES AND OFFICES

Question: In the official Litany of Our Lady (*Litaniae Lauretanae B.V.M.*) Mary is called "Queen of All Saints." Why is it that the common Mass for the feasts of Our Lady in the Roman Missal and likewise the common Office of Our Lady in the Breviary are placed *after* all the common of the other saints?

Answer: The position of the common and certain other Masses of the Blessed Virgin at the end of the section entitled *Commune Sanctorum* in the Missal, as also that of the Common of feasts of Our Lady in the corresponding section of the Breviary, is evidently not due to any lack of recognition of her surpassing dignity but for reasons of convenience. The Common of the Blessed Virgin in the Breviary provides offices not only for the feast but for its Octave, which is not the case with the Common of Apostles and of other Saints, for which only the office for the feast itself is furnished. We are of the opinion that the arrangement in the Missal was influenced by that in the Breviary. Were precedence *ratione dignitatis* the norm for the order in

which the Masses and offices are given, the Mass and the office for the dedication of churches, which ranks as a *festum Domini* should appear first in both Missal and Breviary, even before the Common of Our Lady. Here, too, the feast of the dedication of a church is provided with an octave in the Breviary and so comes at the end of offices which are not so provided.

MASS AT THE RE-BURIAL OF DECEASED VETERANS

Question: Before many months the bodies of American soldiers will be brought home for burial. For most of these the *Missa in Die Obitus* has already been offered and the funeral services conducted *absente corpore.* What procedure should be followed when these bodies are brought to church before final interment? Your answer will be a help to many a pastor.

Answer: While we know of no official ruling on the subject, our own opinion is that for the funeral service of a deceased veteran whose body is brought from overseas for re-interment at home the Mass *in die obitus seu depositionis* is the proper one to say. It will be noted that the title of this Mass indicates that it is to be said not only on the day of the death of the deceased (*dies obitus*) but also on the day of his burial (*dies depositionis*). The final interment of such a body seems to us the definite *dies depositionis* of the remains of the dead person and hence the one on which to celebrate the Mass provided for the day of burial.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

HONEST BANKRUPTCY

Question: In the United States the civil law bars legal action for the payment of debts against one who went into bankruptcy, even though afterward he acquires sufficient wealth to pay his creditors fully. Does this mean that a bankrupt is permanently freed in conscience from the obligation of satisfying his creditors? And if so, would it be prudent to explain this to the people in sermons and instructions?

Answer: The release granted a bankrupt by civil law from the payment of his debts, even when he will be able to pay, does not

per se free him from the obligation in conscience, for in itself this enactment merely bars civil action on the part of creditors. Accordingly, the older theologians regarded the bankrupt as free in conscience only in the event that there was some agreement to this effect among the creditors (Cf. Lehmkuhl, *Theologia Moralis*, ed. 9 [Freiburg im Breisgau, 1898], I, n. 1035). But in more recent years another factor has been brought into the problem—the right of the civil government, through the exercise of its eminent power over the material goods of the citizens, to grant a complete release to an honest bankrupt from the obligation even in conscience of paying his debts (except to the extent that he is able when he is declared a bankrupt). That the government of the United States intends to grant this manner of release by virtue of the bankruptcy laws of July 1, 1898 and June 5, 1910 (Cf. Senate Document, n. 10) is a solidly probable opinion, so that one who entered bankruptcy after having tried his best to satisfy his creditors can consider himself freed in conscience subsequently, even though he later becomes prosperous (Cf. Iorio, *Theologia Moralis* [Naples, 1939], II, n. 823; Damen, *Theologia Moralis* [Rome, 1944], I, n. 876). It would seem that there is no reason why this matter should not be explained to the faithful when a priest is discussing in a sermon or an instruction the obligation of paying debts. It should be pointed out, however, that this solution is not applicable when one has entered bankruptcy dishonestly. Moreover, the priest should explain that it is always the more virtuous course for the bankrupt to pay his debts subsequently as an act of Christian charity, even though he is not strictly obliged to do so.

THE PLACE FOR A WOMAN'S CONFESSION

Question: A priest is sick in a hospital, unable to leave his bed. A nurse wishes to confess to him because she finds it very embarrassing to go to confession to the only other priest available, the chaplain. Is the sick priest allowed to hear her confession at his bedside?

Answer: The Church law relevant to this question is as follows: "The confessions of women may not be heard ourside of a confessional, except because of sickness, or of another true

necessity, the precautions being used which the Ordinary shall judge opportune." (Can. 910, §1). Beyond doubt, the phrase, "except because of sickness", refers to the sickness of the penitent, not of the priest; hence it would not be applicable to the particular case. But the other phrase, "another true necessity", would seem to justify the sick priest in hearing the nurse's confession in the circumstances described: For the necessity visualized by the canon is reasonably interpreted to include an occasion when grave inconvenience or embarrassment to the penitent could be presented by hearing her confession outside the confessional. Accordingly, as far as the general law of the Church is concerned, the sick priest could hear the nurse's confession at his bedside. Of course, if there were danger of scandal in the particular instance, he would have to abstain from this procedure, since the divine law would then be involved—unless there were also present some very grave reason to justify him in permitting this scandal. Furthermore, any precautions which may have been prescribed for such a case by the Ordinary must be observed.

MORALITY OF AUTOPSY

Question: Does the Church hold that a surgeon may lawfully perform an autopsy to discover the cause of death or to acquire medical knowledge?

Answer: There is no ecclesiastical law forbidding an autopsy for the reasons mentioned by the questioner. However, the divine law demands reverence for the bodies of the dead, particularly the bodies of the faithful; and accordingly the dissection of a body for no adequate reason—for example, merely through curiosity—would be illicit. On the other hand, an autopsy is surely lawful when the purpose is to settle the suspicion that the deceased person was murdered. Again, the reasonable hope that medical science will profit from an autopsy and be better equipped to aid the sick in future will certainly justify the dissection of a corpse. Medical students can acquire an adequate knowledge of human anatomy only from this procedure. However, it should be emphasized that when a sufficient examination of the body has taken place, what remains of it should be buried.

A modern writer on pastoral medicine makes these remarks:

"The priest may also be consulted about the advisibility of dissecting a corpse. From the standpoint of medicine it may be said that all too few *post-mortem* examinations are performed on human bodies. Such an examination not only gives the relatives certainty about the cause of death, but when the dissection is performed by an expert, there is at least the possibility of enriching medical knowledge. . . . Though it does not belong to the office of the priest to recommend dissection, still as a familiar and unofficial adviser he may express his views on the question when asked. By counteracting the feeling of horror with which most people view the dissection of the bodies of their relatives, the priest can often contribute to the progress of culture and civilization." (Ruland, L., tr. Rattler, T., *Pastoral Medicine* [St. Louis: Herder, 1936] p. 209).

BENEFICIARIES OF THE *MISSA PRO POPULO*

Question: For whom is the *Missa pro populo* supposed to be offered—only for the Catholics of the parish or, also, for the non-Catholics?

Answer: The intentional fruits of the *Missa pro populo* are, doubtless, intended by the Church for the Catholic parishioners only. For the Council of Trent, speaking of the duties of the pastor, says that he must know his sheep and offer sacrifice for them. (Sess. 23, *De Reform.*, cap. I) Now, in ecclesiastical language the sheep are only the faithful. Some few theologians have expressed the opinion that the deceased members of the parish are also to be included in the intentional fruits, but the view that only the living are intended to be the beneficiaries is much more common. (Cf. Donnellan, T. A., *The Obligation of the Missa Pro Populo* [Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C., 1942] p. 54, ff.). However, it is certainly a commendable deed of charity, and of apostolic solicitude for a pastor to remember in the memento for the living the non-Catholics residing in his parish, since the code states that he is to consider these as commended to him in the Lord. (Can. 1350, §1)—and in the memento for the dead those members of the parish who have passed into eternity.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C. SS.R.

Analecta

The July and August numbers of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* report the proclamation of the canonization respectively on June 22, 1947,[1] of Blessed John de Britto, Martyr, Blessed Bernard Realino and Blessed Joseph Cafasso, Confessors, and on July 6, 1947,[2] of Blessed Michael Garicoïts, Confessor, and Blessed Elizabeth Bichier des Ages, Virgin.

Four allocutions of our Holy Father are found in the August number, addressed on July 9, 1946, to the faithful assembled in Rome for the canonization of Mother Cabrini;[3] and to the faithful similarly assembled for the beatification of three Servants of God: on Oct. 22, 1946,[4] for the beatification of Marie Thérese de Soubiran; on Oct. 28, 1946,[5] for the beatification of Teresia Eustochio Verzeri; and on Nov. 27, 1946,[6] for the beatification of the twenty-nine Franciscan martyrs who died in China in 1900.

A letter of our Holy Father, dated March 25, 1947,[7] appointed His Eminence, James Cardinal McGuigan, the Legate of the Holy See for the Marian Congress held in Ottawa. On June 19, 1947,[8] our Holy Father addressed a radio message to the faithful gathered at the Congress, delivered partly in French and partly in English. In appointing his Legate, our Holy Father urges him to remind the faithful of the meaning of true liberty which springs from truth and to show them that this true liberty springs also from Mary, who was of all the most free. In the radio message, he recalls that from the moment Jacques Cartier planted the cross on Canadian soil and raised an image of the Blessed Virgin in the wilderness, our Lord entered into that land with His cross and with His Mother, and that under Her aegis and in Her cause all the efforts of Canada's priests and martyrs were zealously expended. He empowers his Legate to confer on the assembled faithful the Apostolic Blessing; and at the end of the radio message, he himself confers it.

Another letter, dated May 24, 1947,[9] was sent by our Holy

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXIX (1947), 249.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 281.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 292.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 301.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 305.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 307.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 254.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 268.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 256.

Father to His Excellency Most Rev. Joseph Charbonneau, Archbishop of Montreal, on the occasion of the National Congress of the Young Christian Workers (*La Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne*) of Canada. In it our Holy Father, emphasizing the importance of a properly disposed body of young workers, suggests that the National Congress should be an occasion for the recapture of the basic principles that should dominate the development and the zeal of youth, of the fundamental truths of faith which prevent the growth of illusionary doctrines, and for the recognition of the need of fidelity to Christian morality and of the indispensable strength derived from the frequentation of the sacraments. With this recognition should go an unswerving loyalty to the Church and to its hierarchy. On such foundations rests the only secure plan of Catholic Action; on them alone can the work of the royal priesthood of the laity be grounded. In concluding the letter, our Holy Father congratulates all who have shared in the founding and in the fostering of the movement which has already accomplished so many holy designs, and he confers on them, as a promise of heavenly favors, his Apostolic Benediction.

A letter of June 16, 1947,[10] was sent by our Holy Father to His Eminence, Emile Cardinal Roques, Archbishop of Rennes, appointing the latter Legate to the National Eucharistic Congress held in Nantes, and to the faithful assembled there a radio message was sent by our Holy Father on July 4, 1947.[11] In the letter to His Eminence, our Holy Father recalls the previous National Eucharistic Congress held at Lisieux ten years before, at which he was the Legate of the Holy See and at which he dedicated the new church in honor of St. Thérese, and he insists that it is a consoling and a hopeful sight to see the faithful of France thus giving public testimony of the bond of charity that unites them with one another and with their Eucharistic Lords In his radio message to the Congress, our Holy Father recall. that in his letter of June 29, 1940, addressed to the Hierarchy of France, he assured them that France was endowed with the resources to turn her misfortune into a spiritual renaissance and that the present Congress is a visible realization of his prophecy. He reminds the faithful that they are called to the apostolate of Catholic Action, an apostolate in which they have already achieved enviable results, but he recalls that in the fulfillment of

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 290.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 311.

this vocation they cannot use the methods of the world, especially they cannot be moved by the spirit of partisanship, alienated from their adversary by hate, and seeking his subjugation. It is the charity of the Saviour, rather, on which all their efforts must be modeled. It is in the resolve to hearken to the call and to fulfill it in charity that they must gather before the Eucharistic Altar on this occasion of their National Congress, and to it they must dedicate their lives, their families, and their country. While they make this mystic offering, the Vicar of Christ is in their midst, recommending their cause to the Divine Master; urging them to prayer, vigilance, and charity; and conferring on them as a promise of future heavenly favors his Apostolic Benediction.

An Apostolic Letter of April 23, 1947,[12] was sent to the Hierarchy of Brazil. In it our Holy Father recalls his radio message directed five years previously to the faithful of Brazil assembled in a National Eucharistic Congress. On that occasion, he expressed his satisfaction that one of the purposes of the Congress was to find a practical solution of the problem of vocations to the priesthood. Now he congratulates them on the tremendous efforts put forth on behalf of the Seminary of Brazil and of priestly vocations. He insists on the importance of a seminary for every diocese, and suggests that if practical difficuties prevent the establishment of a minor seminary in every diocese, a beginning might be made with the establishment of at least a pre-seminary or a preparatory seminary. He also recommends the establishment in every diocese of the Pontifical Work for Priestly Vocations as a means of recruiting candidates for the seminaries. He assures them that persistent and organized effort is bound to bring results, as is amply shown by the success of zealous pastors and of religious communities everywhere. The Letter closes with the Apostolic Benediction.

On June 2, 1947,[13] our Holy Father delivered an allocution to the Cardinals assembled to congratulate him on his patron's feast day. In this allocution our Holy Father laments the failure. of the victors in the war to bring that security, that prosperity, and that liberty which were set forth as the aims of the conflict. He points to the sad plight of youth, especially the temptations to cynicism and pessimism resultant upon this failure. He recalls

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 285.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 258.

that the condition of the family and of women is similarly threatened by the fear of men to assume the responsibility of bringing children into the world. But they are encouraged to resist the false concepts of society which are responsible for these sorry results. Let them resist those false concepts with faith and hope and love. To those who thus resist the future belongs. The duty entrusted to them by Divine Providence is not to make a weak and pusillanimous peace with the world but to establish in the world a peace that is worthy in the sight of God and men.

In an allocution of June 30, 1947,[14] our Holy Father acknowledged the address of England's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary on the presentation of his credentials. In the allocution our Holy Father observes with satisfaction that the British people, with a clear perception of reality which one would like to see shared by others, take into account the fact that any further delay in initiating the work of reconstruction is to the disadvantage of the victor and the vanquished alike and he expresses the hope that this concept, supplanting former enmities, may make headway in the councils of the nations' leaders.

In a letter of June 16, 1947,[15] our Holy Father congratulates on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his episcopal consecration Most Rev. Fernando Cento, Archbishop of Seleucia Pieria, Apostolic Nuncio to Belgium and Apostolic Internuncio to Luxemburg, imparting to him the Apostolic Benediction.

Three territorial adjustments made by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith are reported. On Jan. 13, 1947,[16] the Ryuku Islands were transferred from the Prefecture of Kagoshima to the Apostolic Administration of the Vicariate Apostolic of Guam. On Feb. 13, 1947,[17] two districts were transferred from the Vicariate Apostolic of Middle Burma and assigned to the Prefecture Apostolic of Akyab. On April 10, 1947,[18] two parishes were transferred from the Diocese of Mysore to that of Salem.

On June 24, 1947,[19] the Sacred Consistorial Congregation declared that they had incurred the excommunication of canon 2453, §3, specially reserved to the Holy See, who had sacrilegiously attacked Most Rev. Antonio Santin, Bishop of Trieste.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 266.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 291.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 273.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 274.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 316.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 273.

The commission for the introduction of the cause of Matthew Talbot was signed by our Holy Father on Feb. 28, 1947.[20]

The appointment of the following members of the Hierarchy of the United States is reported:[21] March 22, 1947, Most Rev. Floyd L. Begin, D.D., Titular Bishop of Sala and Auxiliary of the Bishop of Cleveland; June 7, Most Rev. Joseph M. Marling, C.PP.S., D.D., Titular Bishop of Taso and Auxiliary to the Bishop of Kansas City; June 21, Most Rev. Thomas Boland, D.D., Bishop of Paterson; June 21, Most Rev. Thomas J. McDonnell, D.D., Titular Bishop of Sela and Auxiliary of the Cardinal Archbishop of New York; Aug. 2, Most Rev. Hubert M. Newell, D.D., Titular Bishop of Zapara and Coadjutor with the right of succession of the Bishop of Cheyenne; Aug. 2, Most Rev. Roman R. Atkielski, D.D., Titular Bishop of Stobi and Auxiliary to the Archbishop of Milwaukee; Aug. 2, Most Rev. James A. McNulty, D.D., Titular Bishop of Methone and Auxiliary to the Archbishop of Newark; Aug. 2, Most Rev. Aloysius Abel Caillouet, D.D., Titular Bishop of Sete and Auxiliary to the Archbishop of New Orleans; Aug. 2, Most Rev. Hugh A. Donahoe, D.D., Titular Bishop of Taia and Auxiliary of the Archbishop of San Francisco.

Recent Pontifical Appointments Announced In the Acta Apostolicae Sedis

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

Nov. 28, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. A. J. Copenolle, Felix Seroczynski, and Michael J. Aichinger, of the Diocese of La Fayette, Indiana.

Dec. 21, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Louis J. Franey, William J. Donovan, and Charles S. Nix, of the Diocese of Rockford.

Jan. 25, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph E. Hanz, Joseph E. Delaney, Otto A. Haertle, Frederick P. Arnold, and Theodore Rohner, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Oct. 24, 1945: John M. Nolan, of the Diocese of Paterson.

Jan. 26, 1946: George J. Heitkamp, James J. Murphy, John E. O'Keefe, and Charles G. Schrup, of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 314 ff.

June 17, 1946: Martin J. Callahan and August J. Long, of the Diocese of Savannah-Atlanta.

Knight of the Order of St. Sylvester, Pope:

June 17, 1946: Bernard S. Fahy, Bernard Kane, and Robert McCormack, of the Diocese of Savannah-Atlanta.

March 7, 1947: James Cammarata, of the Diocese of Winona.

JEROME D. HANNNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D.C.

THE NECESSITY OF PREPARATION FOR PREACHING

The priest who ascends the pulpit without due premeditation on occasions which could easily have been foreseen, is tempting Providence and dishonoring his ministry; he is lowering the dignity of the Gospel message, and exposing himself to well-merited humiliation and criticism. Several years ago, a certain clergyman delivered a discourse in the Baltimore Cathedral, in the presence of some distinguished Prelates, including Archbishop Hughes. At the dinner which followed, the preacher remarked: "Upon my word, until I entered the pulpit, I had not determined on the subject of my sermon." "I thought as much when I heard you," quietly rejoined the Archbishop of New York.

—James Cardinal Gibbons, in *The Ambassador of Christ* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1896), p. 288.

CHRIST THE DIVINE EXEMPLAR

Such is our supernatural vocation; to be conformed to Jesus, live like Jesus, become Jesus.

The incarnate Word is the unique and universal ideal which all those predestinated by love should represent and manifest: seculars, priests, religious, virgins or married, for all there is but one example, Jesus Christ Himself, whom they are bound to imitate under penalty of being excluded from the realm of grace. The measure of their perfection, of their supernatural fecundity will correspond exactly to the measure of their adherence to Jesus, and their faithful resemblance to Him: *"Neither is there salvation in any other."*

—Fr. M. V. Bernadot, O.P., in *From Holy Communion to the Blessed Trinity* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop, 1947), p. 109.

Book Reviews

DECRETA SEPTEM PRIORUM SESSIONUM CONCILII TRIDENTINI SUB PAULO III PONT. MAX. Ex autographo Angeli Massarelli (Codice Morganiano ms. A. 225A No-Eboracensi) hic phototypice recuso edidit, adnotavit, prolegomenis instruxit Stephanus Kuttner, praefatus est Sac. Hieronymus D. Hannan. Vashingtoniae: In Aedibus Catholicae Universitatis Americae, M.CM.XLV. Pp. xliii + 103. $5.00.

This publication deals with a manuscript written by Angelo Massarelli (1510-1566), the Secretary of the Council of Trent. Containing the decrees of the first seven sessions of the Council, the manuscript is today preserved under the call-number A.225A in the library which the late Pierpont Morgan donated to the City of New York. Dr. Stephan Kuttner, professor of the History of Canon Law, has edited it for the first time in the volume under review, enhancing the publication by an apparatus of notes and a critical study inscribed *Prolegomena.* At the end of his *Prolegomena* he expresses his thanks to The Catholic University of America, of which he writes: *qua iubente hanc editionem coepi, favente absolvi, largiente typis mandavi.* Indeed a distinguished service has been rendered, not only by Dr. Kuttner, but by The Catholic University as well, in making available and illustrating this precious document. The elegant and noble volume also contains a full facsimile reproduction of the original and an extensive historical preface by the Rev. Dr. Jerome D. Hannan, professor of Canon Law at the same University: in this preface the difficulties and events surrounding the celebration of the Council of Trent are well described and the necessary information concerning Massarelli and his manuscript is presented. The volume is dedicated to His Holiness Pope Pius XII.

This is the story of the origin of Massarelli's manuscript: At the end of the first period of the Council (1545-1547) the Archbishop of Aix-en-Provence, Antoine Filhol, wished to present to King Henry II of France—who, like other rulers of the time, followed the developments of the great assembly with eager attention, care, and lively interest—the correct text of these conciliar sessions. For this purpose he approached Angelo Massarelli, who willingly accepted the charge and transcribed in his own hand, *fideliter ac diligenter,* from the original acts the decrees as requested, adding the bull *Universalis gregis* by which Paul III had appointed the Cardinals Del Monte, Cervini, and Pole as legates to preside at the Council.

Cardinals Del Monte and Cervini themselves executed for Arch-

bishop Filhol written testimonials of Massarelli's trustworthiness, and this document was attached to the transcript by string and seal (reproduced on pp. 2-3 of the edition). There follows the letter of presentation by which the Archbishop of Aix proffered his gift to his king (pp. 4-7). As a matter of fact, however, Filhol never gave the king Massarelli's original autograph: he preferred to keep it for himself, while for his sovereign he had an exact and richly ornamented copy made by an expert scribe of his. This copy is now at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (pp. xiv-xv).

Dr. Kuttner has edited the autograph preserved at New York, and, conscious of its historical, even sacred value, he has shunned no efforts to illustrate its value in the best conceivable manner. In his impeccable critical apparatus he fully lists the variant readings, after a long and patient collation with other texts, especially with the official *Acta* in the critical edition (by S. Ehses) of the Goerres Society, with the very first official edition of Bologna (1548), in a copy authenticated by the Cardinal Legates and preserved in the Vatican Archives; and with copies of the Roman *editio princeps* (1564) of the final official text. He also collated the pseudo-authentic Milan edition of 1548 and the numerous private editions of the sixteenth century all of which, on account of their errors and deviations, are to be considered as *deteriores*. These collations yield excellent results for the classification of the editions, their variants, and their respective value. Moreover, Dr. Kuttner's edition corrects many erroneous or inexact source references among the notes traditionally appended to the text of the decrees, and points out some sources never mentioned before in other editions.

The manuscript, as the titles states, reports only the first seven of the twenty-five sessions which mark, over a period of eighteen years, the accomplishment of the Council of Trent. As we know, the Council reached its end under Pius IV, from whom it received its full approbation in the bull *Benedictus Deus* of Janu. 26, 1564. The first seven sessions were of supreme and fundamental importance. This is readily shown by merely recalling the circumstances under which they were inaugurated. In fact, while everybody realized the necessity of an ecumenical council, and everybody proclaimed his desire for it, and while Protestants and princes alike cried aloud for the need of reform *in capite et membris*, the council was, on the other hand, greatly feared by many, or believed not to be possible, or inopportune and premature. And still, the good witnessed with a sense of frustration the sad spectacle of abuses and moral evils; even the indifferent noticed that manifestly all discipline was despised and all ecclesiastical tradition abandoned. The most alarming fact, however, was the tremendous amount of dogmatic confusion, dissent, and error, even in the most fundamental

questions such as the value of the Sacred Scriptures and Tradition, and especially the nature and essense of Justification. Emperor Charles V himself, for political reasons, was afraid of a discussion of this doctrine, and determined to prevent it. The innovators clamored for a "free and Christian" council, but what they had in mind was to see the power of the head of the Church curtailed and his authority diminished. Human powers, political intrigues, discord, passions, material interests—all met in adverse conspiracy; and not a few among ecclesiastics, even among those whose duty it would have been to take part in the council, feared that in this event they would have to pronounce sentence against themselves on account of benefices accumulated, residence not observed, and the like.

Motives and reasons of this kind had retarded the celebration of the Council for many years. Finally Pope Paul III, regardless of the hostile forces, willed it and so ordered it. In this untrustworthy atmosphere, within as well as outside the walls of the assembly hall, these seven sessions of the first Tridentine period appear as the result of a providential disposition and guidance. Firmly they tell us that errors and deviations are condemned, tradition and unity renewed, the independence and the authority of the Church reaffirmed. Truly solemn for instance is the sixth session, manifestly celebrated *Spiritu Sancto suggerente*: here, Justification is clearly and lucidly demonstrated in thirteen chapters and thirty-three canons as being both remission of sins and inner sanctification, over and against all the theories and cavils of dissenters and heretics.

The most difficult step no doubt was the opening itself of the Council, its first day, the first session. It receives a special treatment in the *Prolegomena* of Dr. Kuttner. We may well say that Dec. 13, 1545, the day of the opening session of the Council, brought back to the Church the shining light of her most glorious ages. A giant task was formulated, proclaimed, and decreed on this great day: the task of bringing "praise and glory to God, increase and triumph to Christian faith and religion, extermination of heresies, peace and union to the Church, reform to the clergy and the Christian people, defeat to the foes of the Christian name." The most distinguished forces of the Church were soon to be mobilized for the realization of this program. Popes, saints, bishops, religious orders new and old, were to put their hands to a most wholesome reform. And Divine Providence aroused hosts of holy reformers.

Of course, it is very interesting to learn about everything the Fathers of the Council did and said in this first daring session. The Massarelli manuscript, in its present edition, gives the first session on pages 8-9. And since the several authentic texts report the minutes of the opening

in different forms, Dr. Kuttner goes into a careful comparative study and presents us with all the variants in synoptic tabulation (pp. xxxiii-xxxviii). Its clear result is to show that the variants leave the substantial agreement intact and that all the divergencies follow merely from different ways adopted in summarizing the minutes of the original *Acta.*

This is undoubtedly a publication of great interest for the students of History and of Canon Law. But also to innumerable others it will be of importance, in view of the fact that the Council of Trent became the pivotal point for the resurgence, the re-establishment, and the consolidation of ecclesiastical discipline, and that there proceeded from it a deep, beneficial influence on the moral and religious life of the nations. Every praise therefore is justly earned by the contribution which America here has made to the history of this great event, by means of a document which is her treasured possesion.

✠ Amleto Giovanni Cicognani,
Archbishop of Laodicea,
Apostolic Delegate.

The Art of a Happy Marriage. By James A. Magner. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1947. Pp. ix + 273. $2.75.

In the emerging but limited number of Catholic books relating to marriage, this book is a worthy and needed contribution. While most, if not all others, explain one or other aspect of marriage *The Art of a Happy Marriage* deals with most of them. It is marked by its comprehensive scope, clarity of expression, ease of reading, realistic insight and common sense. Those who subscribe to the theory that a priest is unable to grasp the practicalities of married life need only note the wealth of specific detail and the factual insight which the author brings to this discussion. They should be agreeably surprised to discover a discussion of such mundane affairs as the cost of a wedding, the time to send announcements, and the cost of driving an automobile.

Fr. Magner's theme indicating that marriage is an art to be developed by study and experience is in itself a needed message to a world which takes marriage for granted. But his explanation of the "know-how" of this delicate and difficult art is even more needed. Catholic couples, as well as others, must realize that if marriage is to be successful it must be prepared for and accompanied by adequate information and knowledge. The complexities of our age demand a measure of guidance and advice greater than that of a simpler and saner era.

This book, written in a style easily understood, offers a human approach to the problem of dating, courtship, love, sex, and marriage.

From the sublimity of marriage as a sacrament to the hard practicalities of the budget, the author carries the reader through the maze of problems facing every Catholic couple before and after their marriage. His facile pen has enabled him to moralize without becoming "preachy," to simplify the complexities of canon law, and to treat the delicate art of sex expression with dignity and nobility. A wealth of information, not easily obtainable elsewhere, is given for that great majority of our Catholic married people who, recent surveys indicate, voice their inadequate preparation for and continuing ignorance of the wider implications of marriage.

One might wish, however, that certain passages had been given added explanation. "As a general rule, a courtship which is devoid of all physical thrill and emotion is as unpromising as one which rapidly descends to the vulgarity of a wresting-match and pre-empts the privileges of marriage"; could miscarry its intended message. Facile readers might also misinterpret the author's position on pre-marital physical examinations by states as indicating a sympathy with prohibitive state legislation in this respect. While the meaning of some few passages as these are unmistakable to the discerning reader, their interpretations by the popular mentality to which this book has an inescapable appeal, might be otherwise.

ALPHONSE CLEMENS

CLAUDE DUBUIS, BISHOP OF GALVESTON. By L. V. Jacks. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1946. Pp. ix + 268. $2.50.

This life of the second bishop of Galveston is presented as a chapter in American Church History and a Chapter in the History of the United States. The hero appears on the background of Texas pioneer days ten years after the Revolution: Mexicans, American settlers, Austrian, Czech, French and German emigrants struggling with the Indians and, even more, against nature, under a hot climate, upon a land infested with rattlesnakes, scorpions, and the terrible mosquitoes, with alternate floods and droughts and recurrences of epidemics of cholera and yellow fever. It took a brave soul to choose Texas as his field of labor. But Claude Dubuis was such a brave soul, and, all through the thirty-six years of his missionary work, he lived up to his motto "endurance, fortitude and courage."

Bishop Dubuis' biography is dedicated to his mother "whose religious ideals and saintly precepts inspired the career of her son." Up to the time of his ordination in 1844 she encouraged her shepherd boy while he struggled with his studies, and, the following year, she blessed his resolve to answer the call to the missions. Claude sailed for Texas on March 20, 1846. His first mission was Castroville, where

he opened a school, built a church in great part with his own hands, ministered to his mixed congregation, and preached the Gospel to the Indians. He was so poor that he sometimes went hungry for two days. In 1852, after a visit to France where he recruited fourteen seminarians, he was appointed vicar-general and sent to San Antonio, where he built St. Mary's Church. In 1860 he followed Bishop Odin to New Orleans and founded a mission at Lake Pontchartrain.

Appointed Bishop of Galveston, he was consecrated in Lyons, Nov. 25, 1862, and returned to Texas, which he found in the throes of the Civil War. In 1866, prompted by the ravages of the yellow fever, and with the co-operation of Mother Angelique, superior of the convent of the Incarnate Word and Blessed Sacrament, he founded a religious institute for the care of the sick and the orphans, the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word.

In 1881, two years after the division of his diocese and the erection of the See of San Antonio, his health, which had been impaired by his strenuous labors, made him resign his See. The last years of his life were spent in France, where he died in 1895; but his heart was still in Texas where his memory was revered and cherished.

Bishop Dubuis's biographer finds the secret of his success as a missionary in "his rare personality, his deep sincerity, his willingness to do hard physical labor, but also in even less tangible factors, his French genius for precision, and for clarity, and in the effect that the cultured cosmopolitan intelect could not help but exert" (p. 213). His life should be an inspiration and an encouragement to the many American priests of today who are working at home or abroad in the foreign missions under difficulties not unlike those which he met and conquered.

JULES BAISNEE, S.S.

KEEPER OF THE KEYS: A LIFE OF POPE PIUS XII. By Thomas McDermott. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1946. Pp. x + 267. $2.50.

This most recent biography of the reigning Pontiff succeeds in portraying in a readable and informative way the life of Pius XII. The style is easy and direct—traits that we might expect of an author who is a lawyer by profession, as is Mr. McDermott. He leaves the reader with a deep impression of the greatness of the present successor of St. Peter.

Great men are not the result of birth alone, and that is nowhere more strikingly proved than in the case of Pius XII. The Finger of God can readily be seen directing his preparation for the exalted office of Supreme Pontiff from the moment in 1901, when Leo XIII, recognizing his talents, gave orders that he be trained as a papal diplomat. His years

in the Vatican State Department fitted him for his first major assignment, Papal Nuncio to Bavaria, in 1917. The exciting events in Germany during the last years of World War I, and the immediately following years when the Communists frequently threatened the life of the Nuncio, are well told. Then came the appointment as Secretary of State in 1930. The author makes much of the considerable traveling done by Cardinal Pacelli, while holding this position, whereby he gained so much first-hand information, especially about the people of the two American continents. As the dark shadows of war drew closer, he bent all his energies in abetting the efforts of Pius XI to avert the ruin of another world conflagration. Exhausted by the labors that he saw were bearing no fruit for peace, that Pontiff breathed his last on Feb. 10, 1939. Less than three weeks later, on the third ballot, Cardinal Pacelli was elected his successor. The chapter on the Conclave of Cardinals is easily the best in this life of the Pope. The author captures much of the solemn grandeur that surrounds the election of Christ's Vicar.

The fruitless efforts of the Pope to avert the approaching war are indicated. Despite his continual prayer and wise counsel whereby the nations' disagreements could have been amicably settled, Germany invaded Poland on September 1st, and World War II was launched. His efforts to restrict the extension of the War, his aid to the War's destitute, and his constant and clear teaching regarding the bases of a just and lasting peace are well described by Mr. McDermott.

The book is meant for popular reading and its brevity explains the author's generally sketchy treatment of his subjects. Nonetheless, there is a wealth of interesting information on the inner structure of Ecclesiastical regimen: the Sacred Congregations, the Cardinals, the election of a pope, papal diplomacy, and so forth.

JOHN W. KELLEY, S.J.

PASTORAL IN BLUE. By Sister Mary Charitas, I.H.M. New York: Scapular Press, 1946. Pp. 108. $2.75.

The history of the growth and development of the parochial school will indeed fill many glorious pages when the story of American Catholicism is recorded. To this end, the author of this little book has done a signal favor for some future historian in recounting the life of Ellen Murray, whom many thousands knew and loved as Mother M. Casimir, Superior General of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

Living during a colorful period of modern times, this daughter of Irish immigrants was destined to leave behind her lasting monuments for the benefit of mankind. For above all, Mother Casimir was a

builder of schools. Born in 1850 at Reading, Pennsylvania, she entered the Congregation of the Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary at the age of seventeen. The next two decades of her life were spent in teaching at Scranton and Williamsport, and as superior of Laurel Hill in Susquehanna.

While the Congregation had charge of many schools spread across the nation from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a notable impetus in this respect succeeded her election to the office of Superior General in 1919. Nine years later her eulogist had this to say of her generalate: "History will immortalize you as having built Marywood College and the residence hall; for having opened many new foundations and schools; for having enlarged and extended the arts, science and literature."

This book is something more than a biography. For in its broad outline it chronicles the endeavors of many other servants of God who have dedicated their lives and labors to the education of tomorrow's citizens in the Christian way of life.

GREGORY F. FIGUEROA, S.A.

HUNTER OF SOULS: A STUDY OF THE LIFE AND SPIRIT OF SAINT PAUL OF THE CROSS. By Rev. Father Edmund, C.P. Westminister, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1947. Pp. xi. + 228. $2.75.

Christianity is essentially a Following of Christ. And, in the final anaylsis, the really great figures in the history of the Church are those who followed Christ completely to sanctity. *Hunter of Souls* is a book about one of these saints, namely, St. Paul of the Cross, the founder of the Passionists and an outstanding saint of the eighteenth century. In presenting *Hunter of Souls,* Fr. Edmund has divided the study into two parts in which he treats respectively of the life and spirit of St. Paul of the Cross.

The first part, the life of Saint Paul of the Cross, is a very interestingly written account that takes us from the birth of the saint in 1694 to his death in 1775. Here the principal emphasis is on St. Paul's life work, the giving of missions through the Congregation which he founded. It shows us a man making his way through countless, continual, and almost insurmountable difficulties to establish the Congregation of the Passion. The bare recital of the events of Saint Paul's life is a clear proof of a thing that is sometimes forgotten, namely, the fact that a work is the work of God does not mean that God is going to make the carrying out of that work easy. By his fight against these odds we have the change whereby Paul Francis Daneo became St. Paul of the Cross; by his fight against these odds we have in the Church today the Congregation of the Passion.

The second part, the spirit of St. Paul of the Cross, is a series of studies showing us the Founder, Mystic, Missionary, Director of Souls, and the Saint of the Cross. These show the many talents of this great saint and how well he used them as a "good and faithful servant" of Christ. It is difficult to single out any one of these aspects, but this reviewer would like to remark the chapter on St. Paul of the Cross as a Director of Souls. We expect gigantic courage in the Founder, tireless zeal in the Missionary, consuming love in the Mystic and the Saint of the Cross, and we actually find them. Turning to the Director of Souls, it is refreshing to see the ordinary, every-day, common sense that shows how human he was. In the light of this, it is to be regretted that Fr. Edmund did not include a chapter on St. Paul the Man. There are isolated instances throughout the book showing how human Paul of the Cross was. Undoubtedly many more could be found and presented as a whole to show us St. Paul the Man.

In this work Fr. Edmund admits that he is not bringing out a critical study. He has such studies from others to rely on. Besides this he has had the saint's letters. Regarding the latter, we can be very thankful that Fr. Edmund has made such generous use of them. There is something refreshingly healthy in the words of the saint, and the generous use of St. Paul's own words has greatly helped to add life, warmth, and color to this study. Fr. Edmund deserves congratulations for his work in making this saint better known. After all, St. Paul is not only the founder of the Congregation of the Passion, he is likewise a saint of the universal Church.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

THE SACRIFICE OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT IN DIVINE FAITH

. . . No two thinkers, philosophers, writers, ever did, ever will agree, in all things with each other. No system of opinions, ever given to the world, approved itself in all its parts to the reason of any one individual by whom it was mastered. No revelation then is conceivable, which does not involve, almost in its very idea as being something new, a collision with the human intellect, and demands accordingly, if it is to be accepted, a sacrifice of private judgment on the part of those to whom it is addressed. If a revelation be necessary, then also in consequence is that sacrifice necessary. One man will have to make a sacrifice in one respect, another in another, all men in some.

—John Henry Cardinal Newman, in *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1911), p. 397.